

The Social Studies

VOLUME XLVII, NUMBER 5

MAY, 1956

LEONARD B. IRWIN, *Editor*

A. E. MCKINLEY, JR., *Managing Editor*

HYMAN M. BOODISH, *The Teachers' Page Editor*

DAVID W. HARR, *Book Review Editor*

IRWIN A. ECKHAUSER, *Visual Aids Editor*

EDITORIAL BOARD

HATTIE M. ANDERSON
*West Texas State Teachers
College
Canyon, Tex.*

JAMES J. FLYNN
*Fordham University
New York, N. Y.*

DANIEL C. KNOWLTON
*Cazenovia Junior College
Cazenovia, N. Y.*

EDWIN M. PURINTON
*Maine Central Institute
Pittsfield, Me.*

JULIAN ARONSON
*Bushwick High School
New York, N. Y.*

J. MONTGOMERY GAMBRILL
*Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Md.*

ROY F. NICHOLS
*University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pa.*

HOMER T. ROSENBERGER
*U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.*

ARTHUR C. BINING
*University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pa.*

BESS HEDGES
*College High School
Bartlesville, Okla.*

CHARLOTTE M. NOTEBOOM
*University of South Dakota
Vermillion, S. D.*

HERBERT WING, JR.
*Dickinson College
Carlisle, Pa.*

THOMAS WOODY
*University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pa.*

Contents

As the Editor Sees It	162
Revolutions, Digested and Undigested	<i>J. S. Schapiro & K. K. Schapiro</i> 163
What Is a Liberal?	<i>R. E. Gross</i> 171
Motivation through Generalization	<i>S. Spiegel</i> 175
Tips for Travel	<i>E. S. Beer</i> 178
A Philosophy of Government	<i>R. Lehtreck</i> 182
Compulsory Military Training As a Social Good	<i>R. C. Brown</i> 184
The United Nations' Debt to the League of Nations	<i>E. W. Thornton</i> 187
The Teachers' Page	<i>H. M. Boodish</i> 191
Visual and Other Aids	<i>I. A. Eckhauser</i> 195
Book Reviews and Book Notes	<i>D. W. Harr</i> 197
Current Publications Received	200

THE SOCIAL STUDIES does not accept responsibility for the views expressed in articles, reviews, and other contributions which appear in its pages. It provides opportunities for publication of materials which may represent divergent ideas, judgments and opinions.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICE: 809-811 North 19th Street, Philadelphia 30, Pa.
Subscription \$3.50 a year, single numbers 50 cents a copy.

Published monthly, from October to May inclusive, by McKinley Publishing Co., 809-811 North 19th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1956, McKinley Publishing Co. Entered as second-class matter, October 26, 1909, at Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879

As the Editor Sees It

There have been articles from time to time in these pages urging the teaching of geography in our schools. Probably at some time the same point has been made in our editorials. We feel strongly about it, because we believe it is highly important and yet comparatively neglected. Our impressions on this point come in part from the practical experience of trying to employ high school teachers to teach geography. We would be startled, to say the least, to have an applicant for a social studies position respond: "Oh yes, I have had several college courses in geography and I would rather teach it than anything else." Such an answer would strongly impel us to reach for a pen and a contract form; a *rara avis* like that should be signed up with no hesitation.

Why geography? Why should one expect to find a teacher who wants to teach it? Well, for one reason, because it is one of the easiest social studies areas to sell to the pupil. The boy who can see no point in learning about the past can very often understand quite readily why he should learn something about Cyprus, Viet Nam, Alabama or Alaska. No place is too far, and no one too unimportant to be sure he will never go there. World War II and Korea have proved that, and the ever-increasing army of American tourists confirms it.

The kind of geography we mean is not the old-fashioned economic or commercial geography, with its emphasis on climate, topography, and industries. We believe every American should know, first, what the world consists of, map-wise; and second, what are the interesting and significant features of a given area. Without such knowledge, how can anyone intelligently read a newspaper or a novel; or how can he get the real benefits of whatever traveling he may do? Even the youngster whose ultimate cultural level will be defined by the neighborhood movie theatre and his TV set will gain much more from them if he has been given some fundamentals of social geography. To the pupil who will actually become an edu-

cated person, a basic training in geography will be a short cut to the background knowledge he will eventually gain through a study of history and literature.

Geography has a place of sorts in many, but not all, elementary schools. Generally it is sketchy and incidental and the end-result is dubious. We challenge any teacher to give an unselected group of ninth-graders blank outline maps of the United States and ask them to identify any six states, of their own choice. The results will be depressing. Many will not be able to find their own state.

The situation is even worse in most high schools, for few of them give formal courses in geography. Such as there are are incidental to courses in history. Nor do colleges make any positive contribution to the situation. Courses in geography are few, and tend to be closely associated with economics or some type of science. The great majority of social studies teachers come out of college claiming to be prepared to teach American History. Others have majored in political science (not too much in demand at the high school level); a few have a major in European History, which is useful in a high school teacher. But practically none is prepared and anxious to teach geography. Nothing that the college has given them leads them naturally into that area.

In short, we believe that formal geography, with a social emphasis, should be a part of the high school curriculum; and for that reason, teacher training institutions and college departments should include definite and adequate preparation for teaching geography. The world today is too small for us to be ignorant of it, and places which once were of interest only to the inhabitants and to stamp collectors may tomorrow be in the headlines. No boy of 18 can be sure that he will not, within another year, be wearing a uniform in such unlikely places as Egypt, Singapore, New Guinea or Rabat. It would be well if he knew something about them.

Revolutions, Digested and Undigested

J. SALWYN SCHAPIRO

The City College of New York

KATHERINE K. SCHAPIRO

Franklin K. Lane High School, Brooklyn, New York

The concept of revolution, like that of evolution, is fairly modern. The slow or rapid advance of mankind toward an ever better future came with the idea of progress. This idea, barely glimpsed in the seventeenth century, was clearly proclaimed in the eighteenth, and became an article of faith in the nineteenth century. As the belief in progress became stronger, the more ardent became the determination to accelerate it, consciously and deliberately, through the process of revolution.

What is "revolution" in the light of history? A clear understanding of this form of change is vital for an intelligent understanding of the problems that confront the world today. Historically considered, a revolution aims to create a new set of values and relationships by changing the institutions prevailing in a nation. This change is effected by means of a popular uprising against those in authority, in the course of which the existing order, political or social, or both, is overthrown. A new order, political or social, or both, is then established. If it succeeds in maintaining itself the uprising is termed a "revolution." But if it fails to maintain itself the uprising is not a "revolution" but a "rebellion." Success makes the difference. Countless rebellions have taken place in history, but comparatively few revolutions, and these in modern times. Let us then examine the four great revolutions, the English, the American, the French, and the Russian, each of which has profoundly influenced world history. Those nations now caught in the life and death struggle with the forces of violent change can learn much by studying the nature of each of these revolutions.

Curiously enough the cautious, reserved, moderate English were the first people to make a revolution. That was the "Glorious Revolution of 1688," which took place in the early

modern age when the very concept of revolution was hardly known. How did it happen? And why in England? To answer these questions it is necessary to emphasize the historic fact that of all the representative assemblies established in Western Europe during the Middle Ages, the only one that managed to survive and to become a cherished heritage was the English Parliament. Largely for this reason government by king and parliament, even when the latter played a secondary role, became the most powerful, the most persistent of English traditions. A challenge to this tradition was bound to arouse the nation. And a challenge did come with the attempt of King Charles I to establish personal rule. Such a king had to be dealt with. Little did Charles realize the nature of the powerful forces that would arise to oppose his tyranny, even to the point of civil war. In 1642 an uprising took place against the king, the chief object of which, at first, was to restore parliament in the government. As the conflict progressed, the more radical elements, led by the Puritans, seized control. Charles was "executed," put to death according to a judicial process. Upheaval followed upheaval after this unprecedented event. The pace of revolution greatly increased. The monarchy was abolished and a republic established, only to be followed by the military dictatorship of Cromwell. What the English wanted, however, was a king, not a dictator. Finally the Stuart dynasty was restored in the person of Charles II, to the great joy of the people, who, as formerly, wished to be governed by king and parliament. The uprising of 1642 turned out to be a rebellion not a revolution.

But the English remained ever on the alert guarding their treasured political heritage. When another king, James II, flouted laws enacted by parliament he too faced an aroused

nation. Again a king had to be dealt with. This time, however, parliament decided to take off his crown, not his head. A popular uprising in 1688 resulted in the ousting of James and in making William and Mary king and queen of England. Though initiated by the Whigs, the "Revolution of 1688" had the cooperation of many Tories. It was accepted by the English people, eventually even by those Tories who had taken the side of James.

The Revolution of 1688 has been described as the most moderate and most successful revolution in modern history. No changes were made in the existing class structure of English society, with its patterns of life and conduct. Accepted moral values were honored. Property rights were respected. No class was liquidated. Religious beliefs and practices were given a fair degree of toleration. The legal system and the courts continued as before.

What then did happen to justify the greatness of the Revolution of 1688? It made a highly important political advance, in which the English showed their characteristic genius of making great changes in the substance of government while adhering strictly to traditional forms. Within the framework of government by king and parliament a significant shift of power took place. Parliament was now definitely recognized as the supreme power in the state; and the "liberty of the subject" was now guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Though parliament was elected by a narrow suffrage, and individual liberty was circumscribed, the Revolution of 1688 achieved the great distinction of creating, definitely and permanently, a system of constitutional government and civil liberty, the model of the liberal state. It was clearly a *political* revolution, which created a peaceful mechanism for the progress of the nation.

Government by king and parliament, with the latter in the position of supremacy, has continued in Britain unchallenged to this day. The Revolution of 1688 may be termed a "digested" revolution because its principles have been assimilated into the political bloodstream of the British people. This is the "efficient secret" of the two party system, according to which the party out of power opposes the policies of the party in power, but never the constitutional system under which both function. How great

was the influence of the spirit of 1688 became evident during the bitter struggle over the Reform Bill of 1832, which aimed to make drastic changes in parliamentary representation. Again a great political change took place within the framework of government by king and parliament. And again it was loyally accepted by the Tory party that had opposed it. Now that parliament had become more representative of the people, widespread demands arose that the power of government should be used to reform the social and economic order. Thus all during the nineteenth century the government, whether Liberal or Conservative, was engaged in promoting "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" through reforms of all kind, notably free trade, factory reform, poor laws, emancipation of trade unions, popular education, and the enfranchisement of the lower classes. And the advances made by one party were loyally accepted by the other.

Reform became an established English tradition. In the twentieth century the socialist Labor party advocated a radical reform of the social and economic system which became the supreme national issue. When the Labor party came into power it established the "Welfare State," with its basic idea of security for all against the hazards of economic life, "from the cradle to the grave." Again, within the historic political framework of king and parliament, a drastic reorganization of the social order was peacefully effected, and has since been loyally maintained by the Conservatives. The primal source of all this was the digested Revolution of 1688, which by integrating the political pattern of the nation created an underlying unity of all classes and all parties.

An uprising similar in character to the English Revolution, but wider in aim, was the American Revolution. Though separated from England by the Atlantic the American colonials were Englishmen who adhered to the same laws, traditions, language, and culture as did their brothers in the mother country. In this respect the Revolution of 1688 was part of their political tradition. Thomas Jefferson, the philosopher of the American Revolution, was a disciple of John Locke, the philosopher of the English Revolution. However, the eighteenth century, which had intervened between these

two movements, witnessed the flowering of radical ideas in government, in religion, and in social organization. Hence the American Revolution had a wider outlook, broader sympathies, and a more radical attitude toward the social order than its predecessor. This was evident in the Declaration of Independence which sounded the eighteenth century keynote of universality, that "all men are created equal" with "unalienable Rights" to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. However, the American Revolution was in the main a political movement which sought to create a new and better system of government. Its end product was the federal Constitution, a document bold and daring in matters political, but cautious, even conservative, in matters social.

In founding the federal Republic the fathers of the Constitution abandoned the traditional English framework of government by king and parliament. To establish a republic in a nation with a large territory was a bold innovation; a republican government was then considered suitable only to city states, such as Geneva and Venice. In the federal system the authors of the Constitution showed their mastery of political art. Because of the large powers reserved to the states, each of them could become an experiment station; whatever changes it made would be limited to its own area, and the nation as a whole would not be directly affected. By creating machinery for progress with safety the federal system may be considered as America's greatest contribution to political theory and practice. The American Bill of Rights marked another great advance. It went much further than the English Bill of Rights by guaranteeing freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and of assembly.

When it came to matters social, however, the Constitution took great care not to disturb the existing patterns of social and economic life. The radical changes in government were likely to receive popular support, provided the daily routine of life, manners, beliefs, and practices remained undisturbed. Of all institutions, people are most acutely and fearfully sensitive about property and religion. When it came to these matters the Founding Fathers were extremely circumspect. The Fifth Amendment clearly and definitely protected property rights in the "due process" clause and in the right to

"just compensation" for private property taken for public use. Many American Tories did have their property confiscated. But the property so lost by one individual was acquired by another, leaving the property system unchanged. After the Revolution some of the Tories had their property restored to them. In its determination to protect property rights the constitution went so far as to recognize slavery, in the provision for apportioning representatives, counting the "Free Persons" and the "three fifths of all other Persons." Some of the American revolutionists were opposed to the institution of slavery, but they did not raise the issue. They had no desire to fight the American Revolution and the Civil War at the same time.

In the sphere of religion the Constitution made a great innovation without disturbing existing conditions. It forbade the establishment of a national church, creating for the first time the separate co-existence of church and state on the national level. At the same time it left undisturbed the religious practices in the states, some of which continued to maintain established churches. The Constitution did not *separate* church and state; it refused to unite them. In this way the Founding Fathers indicated that the best method of solving the difficult religious problem was not to create it. By making religion a private matter the Constitution created a national model for the states to follow. And they all did.

Like the Revolution of 1688 the American Revolution has been a digested one. Once the new order was established by the Constitution it was accepted by all the elements, all the parties in the newly formed nation. The arch conservative Hamilton and the arch radical Jefferson became members of Washington's cabinet. Conservatives accepted it because the Constitution left the established social order undisturbed, and gave special protection to property rights. And the radicals accepted it because, however rigid in many ways, the Constitution did create new machinery that could be used to make changes in the social order. And, from Jeffersonian democracy to the Roosevelt New Deal, radical parties have succeeded in making significant reforms in the American social structure, all within the framework of the Constitution, which showed itself

less difficult to amend than had once been thought.

As in England, whatever advance has been made by one party has been accepted by the other. A notable instance in our time is the New Deal, the American version of the Welfare State, which was put through by the Democrats and is now accepted, even extended in some ways, by the Republicans. Again, it was a digested revolution, the American Revolution, which created the fundamental bond that binds all Americans, Norman Thomas Socialists no less than Herbert Hoover Republicans. Even the D.A.R. proclaims the "Spirit of '76."

Let us now turn to France. There the French Revolution, inspired like the American Revolution by eighteenth century libertarianism, turned out to be very different from its predecessor in outlook, in method, and in aim. The French Revolution was the most romantic, the most dramatic, and the most inspiring of revolutions. Its generous principles of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity received enthusiastic support everywhere. To this may be attributed its appeal, its wonder, its tragedy. It lasted a decade, from 1789 to 1799, and passed through several stages, each more violent and more extreme than the preceding one. Like the English and the American, the French Revolution was a political overturn in that it changed the structure of government, but far more radically and far more swiftly. During this decade France passed from absolute to constitutional monarchy; from that to a democratic republic; from that to a party dictatorship suggesting totalitarianism, and finally to a military dictatorship. But the French Revolution was also a *social* revolution, the first in modern times. Therein lies its startling significance. Unlike a political revolution, which aims to create a new system of government, a social revolution aims to create a new system of society. It uses the power of the state to destroy the existing structure of society and to establish a new structure based on new principles. This involves the liquidation of an old ruling class and the creation of a new one through wholesale confiscations of property and its redistribution, and the establishment of new institutions and values to function in the new social order.

What made social revolution possible in France was that the pre-1789 system of govern-

ment and society, known as the "Old Regime," presented a far greater obstacle to progress than had the British colonial system in America. The government was an absolute monarchy by divine right. Society was based on a system of privilege, or legal favoritism, the chief beneficiaries of which were the aristocrats and the clergy. The Catholic religion was administered by an intolerant church maintained by the government. Commerce and industry were in the hands of monopolistic guilds and corporations. The peasantry was burdened with all sorts of feudal dues and services. There seemed to be but one solution: the antiquated Old Regime would have to go.

So thorough and far-reaching was the French Revolution that not a single institution remained unchanged, and not a single element of the population remained unaffected. The greatest blows were struck at property, religion, and the family, the basic institutions of the social order. During the "Night of August Fourth," 1789 a law decreed the abolition of the feudal system, which deprived the lords of their property rights in dues and services. Then followed the confiscation of the lands of the Catholic church. Then the confiscation of the estates of the emigrant nobles. Most of the sequestered properties were divided and parcelled out to peasants and bourgeois. After this revolutionary redistribution, property was given a new status in law by being made a natural right.

The Catholic church was shaken to its very foundations. After being deprived of its property it was reorganized and made into a department of the government, subordinate to the secular authority. Religious toleration was decreed; Protestants and Jews were completely emancipated and put on an equal footing with Catholics. As the Revolution progressed, blows were struck against religion itself. During the Reign of Terror not only was the church virtually suppressed but efforts were made to de-Christianize France.

A new family system was established. Primogeniture was abolished, and a new inheritance law required that the estate of the father should be shared equally by all his children. Marriage was made a civil contract, hence terminable by divorce.

That was not all. The social order underwent

drastic changes affecting other aspects of life. The judicial system was entirely made over. Free enterprise was established by the abolition of the monopolistic guilds and corporations. A new system of weights and measures, the metric system, was established. A new system of education was begun. Changes were made even in political geography, with the abolition of the provinces and the redivision of France into "departments."

These revolutionary changes affecting the intimate life of individual citizens resulted in a revulsion of feeling against the Revolution among large numbers of people. Traditions, attitudes, habits, could not be uprooted by sweeping laws, even when enforced by terrorism. A great division arose in France, between those who favored and those who opposed the Revolution. And, within these, further divisions arose between moderates and extremists. In such a situation civil war was inevitable, and France was soon convulsed in internal strife. Furthermore, a social revolution, unlike a political revolution, does not aim merely to regenerate the nation but to regenerate all mankind. It takes on the aspect of a secular religion which must be spread, by the sword if necessary. The French Revolution soon overflowed its national boundaries and became a world revolution. What followed was war between revolutionary France and conservative Europe. Civil strife at home and fear of foreign invasion threatened to disrupt the nation. To save the situation came the military dictatorship of Napoleon.

These tragic events brought in their wake a legacy of bitter resentments and hatreds between the opponents and the supporters of the French Revolution. In such an atmosphere there could be no possibility of achieving national unity. Thus the French Revolution became the classic example of an undigested revolution. Instead of France, "one and indivisible," which the men of 1789 had aimed to create, two Frances appeared between which yawned a chasm so deep and so wide that all attempts to bridge it ended in failure. Each of *les deux France*, the Left and the Right of this Great Divide, considered the other as its most bitter enemy, and sought at all times for an opportunity to get even. Every generation since the Revolution has witnessed a conflict between

them, sometimes in open warfare at the barricade, sometimes in bitter parliamentary conflicts. Clemenceau, speaking for the Left, once expressed this deep division as follows: "This admirable Revolution from which we have risen is not finished and still continues. We are still participants in it; always do the same men fight the same enemies. Yea, what our ancestors wanted, we also want. We meet always the same opponents. You have not changed, and neither have we. This struggle must then go on until one side or the other wins a definite and decisive victory."

A tradition of uncompromising radicalism was another heritage of the French Revolution. The extreme Left, whatever it was, could always count on the support of the radical elements in the nation. First it was republicanism; then socialism; and now it is communism. During the nineteenth century the main division was that between royalists and republicans. Even sharper was the division within the latter, that between the democratic *bourgeoisie* and the socialist workers. The French Revolution had popularized the idea that social revolution was the only true and sure method of progress. Had not the feudal order that had existed since Charlemagne been destroyed overnight? Why could not the recently established capitalist order be destroyed in a similar fashion? Various schools of social revolutionists appeared, ranging from anarchism to socialism, all of which proclaimed what they called *La Révolution*, according to which the French Revolution was only the beginning of a still greater overturn, "the final struggle," that would establish the reign of economic equality. The barricade, not parliament, was considered the real place of national decision. No sooner was a Republic established than it had to fight for its life against enemies on the Right and on the Left. And the latter was the more deadly enemy. The Second Republic had to suppress an uprising of the workers in the "June Days" of 1848; and the Third Republic, the far greater uprising of the Paris Commune of 1871.

After the Commune, conditions became more propitious for the Third Republic, which became the most stable government in France since 1789. It lasted seventy years, outliving the preceding two monarchies, two republics, and two empires. Its longevity can be explained

by the fact that the socialist workers forsook *La Révolution* after the débacle of the Commune, and rallied to the side of the Republic. However, the conflict between the "two Frances" continued on the floor of parliament, as in the famous *Affaires*, MacMahon, Boulanger, and Dreyfus. During the Dreyfus Affair an unprecedented solidarity was achieved between the moderates and the extremists on the left. "Pas d'ennemi à gauche," was the slogan. For the first time a Socialist was included in the ministry, formed in 1899, to defend the Republic. In the vindication of Dreyfus the royalists suffered so great a defeat that they ceased to have any political importance.

Was then the French Revolution finally digested? It seemed so. A democratic republic was firmly established; church and state were separated; a national system of secular education was created; and a social security system for the benefit of the workers was begun. These were the great objectives of the French Revolution, the achievement of which brought a sense of unity to the French people.

This unity was strikingly shown during the First World War. When it broke out all parties, from the extreme Right to the extreme Left, formed a "sacred union" to support the government. During the conflict the valor, the hardihood, and the determination of the French armies were supported, with but few exceptions, by the nation behind them. Never will history forget the Battle of Verdun, the greatest battle of the war. All the heroic Frances of the past were there: the France of Joan of Arc, of Louis XIV, of the French Revolution, of Napoleon. During this terrific struggle France looked into the face of national death in the spirit of rational calm, and fought with the ardor of romantic passion. It seemed as if the spirits of Descartes and Victor Hugo, arm in arm, floated before the French armies, inspiring them to victory. The Germans did not, could not, pass.

France emerged from the war victorious but almost lifeless. The best part of a generation of young men had died on the battlefield or had returned crippled in body and in spirit. The destruction of property by the German invaders was so great that the reparations actually paid compensated little for the losses suffered. To this day France has not recovered from its

victory in the First World War. In this sore state, old wounds, that seemed healed, reopened and festered on the body politic. Once again the "two Frances" appeared on the national scene, each blaming the other for having caused the catastrophe. The division, however, was no longer that between royalists and republicans but between those who favored democracy and those who favored totalitarian dictatorship, communist or fascist. The primal cause of the new division was the same as that of the old, the undigested French Revolution. Several times the Third Republic was placed in jeopardy by fascist and communist attempts to overthrow it. Frenchmen became so terrified that they despaired of the Republic.

The Second World War provided the supreme test of the vitality of the democratic nations. Would the people stand solidly united behind their government to preserve their ideals and way of life from destruction by the fascist powers? In Britain and America they did. Not so in France. There Right and Left were more eager to fight each other than to fight their common enemy, Germany. To those of the Right it was, "Better Hitler than Blum." To those of the Left, Socialists and Communists, the "bourgeois Republic" was not worth defending. The French armies fought halfheartedly, and the people behind them relapsed into a state of despondent indifference. In 1940, less than a year after the outbreak of the war, France fell. Hitler himself was astonished at the swift and complete collapse of the nation that had fought so heroically and so doggedly in the previous war. What really happened was that the Third Republic just lay down and died.

The same division now plagues the Fourth Republic, established after the Second World War. In the 1956 elections, the Communists and Poujadists, both hostile to the Republic, together elected one-third of the National Assembly. At present divided France presents the sorry spectacle of instability in government, backwardness in economic development, and virtual paralysis in international affairs. In the words of former Premier Paul Reynaud, France is now "the sick man of Europe."

Is there any cure for this persistent malady of the French nation? In the opinion of many admirers of the nation that has given so much to modern civilization the cure lies primarily

in giving a new deal to the "most numerous and the most poor," the working class. The great support of the Communist party comes from the workers, whose standard of living has risen little since 1945. The French worker votes Communist, not because he longs to enter "le paradis russe," but out of sheer exasperation with an economic system that denies him his rightful share of the national wealth produced. As the worker rallied to the side of the Third Republic against the royalists so will he rally to the side of the Fourth Republic against the communists, once he is convinced that its greatest concern is to advance his well-being. Then and then only will the French Revolution have been "digested," and France will take its rightful place among the democratic nations.

Let us now turn to Russia, where another social revolution took place. It would be hardly an exaggeration to state that the Russian Revolution of 1917 was the greatest social upheaval in all modern history, going far deeper and spreading far wider than had the French Revolution. The latter, as already indicated, had confiscated noble and church lands, but had established the property system on a firmer basis than hitherto. The Russian Revolution, inspired by Marxism, repudiated the very principle of the institution of property. It confiscated and then nationalized all productive property, whether in agriculture, commerce, or industry. All the propertied classes as such, aristocrats, bourgeois, peasants, were liquidated. Religion, like property, was condemned to extinction. Communist Russia, motivated by the philosophy of materialist atheism, set out to abolish not only Christianity but all religious beliefs and practices. Similar revolutionary changes were made in all other spheres of social life: in family relationship, law, education, even in art, literature, music, and science. Literally everything formerly valued and practiced was doomed to extinction.

What was the communist attitude toward the state? As the state was to be used to transform not only the political but also the social order, the tsarist system, with its laws, institutions, and methods, was straightway abolished. In its stead was established the Soviet system, with complete and absolute power to effect such revolutionary changes. It reversed the trend of modern political development. All

former revolutions had been inspired by democratic ideals and had sought to extend self-government and civil liberty. Not so the communist revolution. In the Soviet system Communist Russia created a totalitarian dictatorship which suppressed individual liberty and self-government far more completely and far more thoroughly than had absolute monarchy. Democracy, neither in theory nor in practice, has had any place whatever in the Soviet system of government. Its high purpose, according to the Communists, is not only to create a new Russia but a new world.

Even more than the French Jacobins did the Russian Communists realize that a social revolution of necessity becomes a world revolution. Then and then only will it triumph over all its enemies everywhere. At no time have the Communists allowed their vision of a Marxist world to fade. In spreading its doctrines and its influence the Russian Revolution has proved to be far more successful than had the French Revolution. At most the latter had overflowed Central Europe, whereas the Russian Revolution has spread to one third of the entire world. It now threatens to engulf every non-communist nation. A glance at a daily paper or a switch of the radio will reveal the fact that the fate of the world constantly hangs in the balance.

It became evident to the Communists that the social revolution must first of all be accepted, digested, and assimilated by the Russian people. A monolithic, "one Russia" must emerge, without which neither a new Russia nor a new world was possible. They were determined to prevent the emergence of "two Russias" which, as in the case of the "two Frances," would keep the nation divided and in constant turmoil. The Communist leaders had made a thorough study of the French Revolution, and came to the conclusion that it had failed to do a sufficiently thorough job on its enemies. It had merely *suppressed* them, by executing or imprisoning the anti-Revolutionary leaders and by compelling their followers to submit. As a consequence hosts of the enemies of the Revolution remained, always on hand preparing for a come-back. Such must not be the situation in Russia.

Then and there the Communists resolved not to suppress, but to exterminate, root and branch, all opponents of the Revolution,

whether active, passive, potential or actual. "The guillotine," declared Lenin, "only intimidated, it only crushed *active* resistance. *For us that is not enough.*" Passive resistance must be overcome in any and all ways by the totalitarian state. Where the French had liquidated thousands the Russians liquidated millions. Whole classes were destroyed, nobility, bourgeoisie, and peasant proprietors, some through execution or starvation, others through exile or slave labor. During the Second World War whole nationalities, suspected of disloyalty to the Soviet regime, disappeared. What became of them no one knows. Marxist materialism inspired the Communists with a cold fanaticism that recked not of human life in striving to establish the perfect society. For them fearful bloodletting was the just price of social revolution.

Merely to wipe out the past was not enough; the future must also be made safe for communism. To this end the rising generation must be conditioned to the full acceptance of the communist way of life and thought. This is at least one explanation for the establishment of totalitarianism, a Russian invention, wherein the state was given complete control of all phases of life. By concentrating every influence, mental, physical, moral, and cultural, on the education of the young, a new man, the "Soviet man," was to be created in Russia. No extraneous ideas or knowledge have been permitted to penetrate the iron curtain drawn over the mind of youth. In this way, according to the Communists, the Revolution would not have to undergo the process of digestion; it would be turned directly into the bloodstream of the national body. The idealism, the generosity, the curiosity, the spontaneity, characteristic of youth were to be stifled by this system of "education." In a strange and weird sense youth was to be abolished in Soviet Russia.

Have the Communists, by these methods, attained their objective of creating "one Russia"? Have they succeeded where the French had failed? The answer is "No." The most numerous element of the population, the peasants, have stubbornly refused to be "digested." From the beginning of the Revolution they have resisted the collectivization of agriculture; they did not wish to lose their identity as proprie-

tors. Millions of them have been deliberately starved, liquidated, sent to slave labor camps; their farms, collectivized, uncollectivized, partly collectivized. Neither appeasement nor repression has been of any avail. Political recalcitrants can be exterminated and replaced, but not so the peasants without whom there can be no food for the nation. In ways best known to themselves, the peasants have managed to impede agricultural production. Recently the Soviet government had to confess that, since 1928, the supply of food relative to population has been decreasing. The simple peasant has confounded all the doctors of Marxism.

Another aspect of indigestion in Soviet Russia is the state of religious belief among the people. Breaking through the crust of totalitarianism another Russia is emerging, Christian Russia. At the beginning of the Revolution the Communists had determined to eradicate, at any cost, all religious beliefs from the hearts of the people. The Orthodox church especially was subjected to devastating blows. But all in vain. The ikon remained in the home, even though alongside was a picture of Lenin. Thereupon, the Communists decided to use what they could not destroy. The Orthodox church was recognized, and made an agency of the government, as it had been in tsarist days. To the deep chargin of the Communists the people flocked to the church services which were now more freely permitted. An anomalous situation now exists in Russia: the preaching of the Christian faith constitutes an ever present, blank denial of materialist atheism, basic in communist ideology. As long as Christianity is permitted in Russia the totalitarian state has failed of its final aim. The Russian Revolution, despite its herculean efforts to create "one Russia," soviet style, has thus far been an undigested revolution. The continual purges, the discrediting of once true and tried leaders, Trotsky, Bukharin, Beria, Stalin, all are desperate efforts to effect digestion. A social revolution, unlike a political revolution, does not and cannot become the bond of union of a free people.

We cannot quarrel with history but we can learn from it. The dictum of Hegel that we "learn from history that we cannot learn from history" is not true. England certainly learned

from history when, after the loss of the American colonies, it adopted a liberal colonial policy. So did America learn from history when, after repudiating the League of Nations, it gave wholehearted support to the United Nations. Man, because of his spiritual nature, has freedom of will, hence he has a choice of methods to attain well-being. Whatever its immediate benefits a social revolution creates more problems than it solves. History has proved this to be true of the French Revolution, and even more so, of the Russian Revolution. Inevitably it brings civil war, fanaticism, persecution, oppression, dictatorship, and finally world war.

Quite different in its results has been political revolution. As already noted it has sought to create democratic machinery by means of which social and economic problems could be solved, one by one, gradually and equitably. And the greatest of all political revolutions has been the American Revolution. Now that it is challenged by Communism, the greatest of all social revolutions has become vividly conscious of the "Spirit of '76." The founders of the American commonwealth have in recent years been much written about, and their ideas, widely discussed. New biographies have ap-

peared of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton, John Adams, and Madison, who are seen to achieve greater stature as they recede in history. Their supreme accomplishment was the creation of a treasury of civic virtue from which every generation of Americans has drawn, and yet it remains ever full. From the American Revolution has emerged the American reality of the greatest welfare of the greatest number, and the American dream of liberty and equality for all men. And, vitally important for the present generation, it laid the broad foundation on which was built the essential unity of the American people. As in Britain, those who wish to destroy this unity, communists and fascists, have had little political influence. Speaking as a Democrat, Adlai Stevenson said as follows: "I hope we may never forget that we hold far more in common with our friends, the Republicans, than we hold in dispute. Were it not so, neither party could govern, for government rests less on majorities at the polls than on the abiding unity, good sense and obedience of the people." This "abiding unity, good sense and obedience" of the American people has come from the digested American Revolution.

"What Is a Liberal?"

RICHARD E. GROSS

Stanford University

Can we evolve a certain and lasting definition of a liberal? Or must each generation re-identify the word in terms of the specific conditions and the shifting attitudes of that era? Looking back into American history one can find all sorts of men with varying shades of opinion who have labeled themselves or have been known as liberals. Some of these gentlemen, however, a short time later found themselves excluded from the evolving circle of new liberals. The inevitable result has been different views and "schools" of liberalism. Some of the liberalism of 1776, for example, was quite out-

dated by 1787—at least as far as certain very important liberals were concerned. Men of the bent of Sam Adams and John Hancock, all liberals, could come to look upon one another, rather, as radical or conservative.

One key to understanding the changing concept of liberalism can be found in observing the changing role of certain key individuals through the period of their lifetime. Men are said to become conservative as they age and this has certainly been chronicled in history. But what, to cite just one example, of James Madison, one of the authors of the *Federalist*

Papers, who became a leading Jeffersonian? Our textbooks and our biographies do not do enough to explain such developments in the careers of leaders in many aspects of American life.

Another guide in helping us trace the trends in liberalism is the record of the prevalent attitude held concerning the individual, evidenced at different periods throughout the ever-moving history of American society. Essential in the democratic credo is the basic doctrine that the individual is the unit which society is organized to fulfill. However, as the nation matured, prospered, and grew, events transpired to bring shifts in individual social and economic roles. These developments have served to lead liberals to accept aims and/or means once looked upon as anathema, and conservatives have come to enfold theories once feared for their "liberality." Look at the evolution of Democratic-Republican policy from Jefferson through Monroe; trace the meanderings of Republican "principles" from the Fremont platform to that of Eisenhower. Or compare the planks of the Populists or the Socialists of fifty years ago with the Democratic or Republican programs promised in 1936. Not considering the splinter groups, the Liberal Republicans, the Southern Democrats, the Progressives of 1924, and the like, one is still brought to the conclusion that politically in the United States there is no certain dividing line between conservatives and liberals. And a thorough study of economic practices, business theories, and economic leadership can bring one to the same conclusion in the area of economics. We do not live our lives in separate categories and our philosophies generally seem to be a curious admixture of conservatism and liberalism.

It is dangerous, therefore, to draw pictures of contrasting black and white when considering this problem. To further illustrate, the liberal revolutionary forefathers saw the centralized States as one threat and instrument potentially most dangerous to the free development of the individual citizen. But they were not anarchists and they strove, as our early Constitutional history reveals, to produce state and national governments which guaranteed individual rights. Now what has happened? Many modern day liberals see a democratically

responsible but powerful central government as the one avenue by which the rights of individuals and the aims of the common man are to be protected and attained. Yet, in our own day, Herbert Hoover, claiming to speak in the true liberal tradition, points out the crying need for uncommon men and seeks to rally those who, like himself, are dedicated to opposing the continued encroachment of the State upon individual prerogatives. It is unfortunate that some of these men seem to fail to recognize the difference between a human being and a corporation. But can they be blamed? Look at the history of our Supreme Court decisions. Look how the "due process" clause has been distorted or should we say, interpreted. And what of the 10th Amendment and its provisions? All of this may be history, or is it? Are some of the present-day conservatives closer to the liberals of yesteryear than the mid-twentieth century liberals themselves? It seems that these are questions which need much more consideration in the average social studies class than they ever get. In part they reflect a problem of confused ends and means which every American needs to resolve for himself. But certainly there is national need for some such studied resolution. We do need much greater clarity of, and agreement upon, the values and principles to which we are supposed to be loyal. This is basic to continued national progress which parallels the democratic way.

Recently the editor of *The Reporter* magazine had this to say about our dilemma:

"Our belief is in liberalism. In the last few years there has been a distinct tendency in our country to use this word with qualifying adjectives or to quarantine it within quotation marks. Yet it is still difficult to find someone who, no matter how committed to the far Right or Left, withstands the temptation to call himself a liberal in his own sense of the word—once he has made sure that he has escaped being confused with people who are called or call themselves liberals. Few other words, if any, have been so blurred by the "yes, but" treatment. Meanwhile, the idea of liberty is paid constant tribute by American politicians of both parties as a disembodied principle so secure in the high heaven of abstraction as to require no effort to be made operational. Yet what

is a liberal, if not a man who gives all he has to make liberty operational, and develops the highest possible degree of skill this vocation demands?"¹

Then, simply, we are to live in a manner which enables liberty to function so that men may remain free and, where necessary, to promote even greater freedom in human affairs. A liberal will be oriented to view situations so, and will have the competencies to act accordingly. In our citizenship education programs in our schools do we so organize and teach? We do have a problem of semantics here, as well. In spite of a current boom in popularity for conservatism in one form or another, every teacher in America must actually be a dedicated liberal, as the term has been defined above. This is essential to the very existence of our society as a democracy. Again, do our social studies textbooks and instructional materials keep this regularly before the students? Are such liberals and their contributions to America properly identified? Unfortunately, because of the conflicting use and meaning of the term to so many people, we have often failed here. And, as we will see, it will continue to be very difficult to get agreement and gain an operational understanding of just what the word implies.

Recently a doctoral student attempted to discover if the reading and interpretive abilities of high school students in the social studies can be related to their conservative or liberal viewpoints. As part of his research he tried to construct an instrument which would reveal degrees of conservatism and liberalism on the part of the pupils. He perused the articles in liberal and conservative publications; he examined speeches and statements made by liberal and conservative spokesmen as they took their stands on current political, social, and economic issues. He then worked out the following two sets of, what seemed as objectively as possible as far as he was concerned, typical "liberal" and "conservative" statements. His hope was to have students react to these favorably or unfavorably and then to be able to classify them according to their degree of liberalism or conservatism. As one means of validation for his attitude check-list he submitted the two sets of liberal and conservative statements to four top-flight social scientists on the staff of one of our state universities—a

political scientist, an economist, a sociologist and an historian.

Could these experts help him decide on statements which were a true reflection of a liberal or a conservative viewpoint? Going over the following 27 "liberal" and 25 "conservative" statements these professors reached unanimous agreement as to the items being definitely liberal or conservative on but *four* of the fifty-two! It is perhaps unnecessary to report that this instrument was never validated or used; but the factors described above reveal our deep problem in this area. The statements are reproduced below so that the interested reader can see if he categorizes them as ones to which liberals or conservatives would strongly agree or disagree. Are these by and large in the correct liberal or conservative classification? Would students you know, like the social scientists, reveal that their views vary greatly on these items? You may be interested in the items which all four social scientists accepted as being those which would characterize an extreme liberal or conservative philosophy. These were "liberal" statements number 17, 20, and 27 and "conservative" statement number 4. How about yourself?

We may not accept the following categorizations but this writer claims that from the standpoint of our instruction for citizenship education we need to consider much more fully and carefully our sad and serious conundrum—"What is a liberal?"

The "LIBERAL" Statements²

1. The federal government should build low-cost housing units wherever they are needed in the United States.
2. All young people eighteen years of age should be able to vote at federal, state, and local elections.
3. The federal government should begin some form of public health insurance for all the people of the United States.
4. The United States can help itself a great deal by giving money and expert assistance to other countries.
5. Social studies teachers should be free to talk about controversial issues in the high school classroom.
6. A newspaper should be able to criticize the government without fear of interference from that government.

7. The recent Supreme Court decision about desegregation is a good thing for the United States.

8. Some industries are better operated by the government than by private interests.

9. Teachers should be permitted and encouraged to take an active part in politics.

10. It is important that the federal government support by subsidies those small businesses it thinks need that aid.

11. The federal government should establish a system of national scholarships to help needy but capable students to go to college.

12. Private industry would waste much of the natural resources of the country unless it were forced by law to practice conservation.

13. The government should buy surplus food to keep prices from falling too low for the producer.

14. The government should help take care of old people.

15. The federal government should control large industries so that they do not become too powerful.

16. Radio news commentators should feel free to express any opinions they like during their broadcasts.

17. The fairest kind of tax is one that places the burden of taxation on those who can afford to pay.

18. In the long run the United States would benefit if the tariffs on goods coming into the country were lowered greatly.

19. We could deal with Communist China better if she were permitted to have a seat at the United Nations.

20. It is all right for labor unions to support officially a certain political party.

21. The federal government should build schools to help house the greatly enlarged enrollments of pupils.

22. We should try to work out an agreement with Russia to control the atomic bomb.

23. We should spend fifteen million dollars a year to help educate the Japanese.

24. Labor has not enough to say about the country's defense program.

25. Several of our large river systems should be developed by the government along the same general pattern as the TVA.

26. There should be a law which would prevent an employer from refusing to hire a

person just because of his race, religion, or color.

27. All races in the United States should enjoy equal educational, political, and vocational opportunities.

The "CONSERVATIVE" Statements

1. We have been making too great a sacrifice to aid the British people.

2. Public loyalty oaths are a good idea.

3. Every voluntary group should be investigated to see if it conforms with the "American way of life."

4. Much freedom is lost as a country moves toward socialism.

5. A property owner is entitled to charge any rent he likes for a house he owns.

6. This country has gone too far in concerning itself about the problems of other countries.

7. Congress should pass a law forbidding strikes in public utilities and railroads.

8. Other races are less intelligent than the white race.

9. We should prevent visitors from Communist countries from entering the United States.

10. Prejudice against other races is needed to prevent inter-marriage.

11. We can depend upon the good will of big business men to keep their employees happy without passing laws that will force them to take care of their employees.

12. One good thing about racial and religious prejudice is that it keeps undesirable foreigners out of the country.

13. Teachers should be required to take loyalty oaths before they can teach.

14. A university professor who resigned from the Communist party 20 years ago should now be fired.

15. A man who uses the Fifth Amendment so as not to say anything against himself must be guilty.

16. Labor unions are controlled largely by demagogues.

17. Desegregation would have taken place quietly over a period of years in the South without the Supreme Court decision forcing the issue.

18. The Taft-Hartley Bill was a good thing for the country as a whole.

19. Higher wages would naturally come if only the government would stop interfering with business.

20. Senator McCarthy's Congressional investigation committee has done an important and useful work in our country.

21. Stores should refuse to extend credit to Negroes who publicly support desegregation.

22. It is a good idea to have committees in each community to keep objectionable literature off the news stands.

23. We should destroy all books that criticize

the democratic form of government.

24. We need committees to investigate the books in our libraries.

25. It is still possible by means of hard work and initiative to make a million dollars a year in the United States.

¹ Max Ascoli, *The Reporter*, April 21, 1955, p. 112.

² These statements evolved by Harold Covell, Florida High School, Tallahassee, Florida.

Motivation through Generalization

SYDNEY SPIEGEL

Senior High School, Cheyenne, Wyoming

"History in trying to establish the occurrence of individual events on the basis of evidence must assume causal laws according to which the phenomena of human life are connected. . . . Thus historians as a rule assume that men will generally seek their economic advantage, that ambitious generals will get their countries into war, that rebellions are commonly due to misgovernment, that custom will control conduct, but that travel, discovery of new lands, or contact with other peoples tends to break down the unquestioning acceptance of custom and tradition."

— MORRIS R. COHEN

If we will squarely face the fact that there is a poor student attitude toward learning and education in the United States; that anti-intellectual attitudes have permeated among young people as well as older people; that problems of discipline are endemic and recurrent in our school systems; the question then faces us, in this context, how do we teach history? How do we motivate?

Now I have been willing to try out all the motivational schemes, methods, techniques, and gimmicks that I've ever seen, heard of, or read about. I've taught chronologically, topically, and by area studies; I've remembered to be pleasant, smile at students in the halls, and tell a joke occasionally before the class; I've used novel test items, cross-word puzzles, different kinds of historical games, stunts, and other assorted cute devices; I've pepped up my bulletin board; I've had group work, class projects, guest speakers, debates, panel discussions, audio-visual aids—and it has all been insufficient, motivationally speaking, to arouse the necessary enthusiasm for historical study.

What is the difficulty? The trouble is, I believe, that I, as well as many other teachers, have not *satisfactorily* answered the question, "Why do we have to learn this junk?" We have not adequately justified the teaching of the subject and its compulsory status in the curriculum.

Now please understand that I am not opposed to smiling at students, telling jokes, or using any of the educational techniques and devices mentioned above. But it has been my experience that this concern with good methods in teaching history will only result in the students' opinion that the teacher is a nice person. The surveys still show that students feel that they do not need history, and that it's not doing them any good. The problem of motivating students so that they feel that history is of value to them (and so that they will work at their studies with diligence and even enthusiasm) lies not so much in the method of teaching but in the content of the subject matter itself.

The central basis of motivation must be a conviction in the mind of the student that it is

a vital necessity for him to master the subject. If the student is convinced of this, educational devices can become aids to learning and teaching instead of substitutes for them.

Would we have all this emphasis on technique and method if the student were burning up with curiosity and enthusiasm to learn? Isn't the emphasis on technique an indication that there is a great lack of enthusiasm for the subject matter? Isn't the *primary* answer to motivation a *conviction* in the mind of the student that history is practical, necessary, and useful? It's obvious that vocational classes, machine shops, and home economics do not have our problems of motivation.

We should not kid ourselves. In spite of all the work that's been done, in spite of all that's been written about teaching history, the subject is *disliked* by most students. They do not feel that they are getting anything of great value, anything practical, necessary, and useful from a study of history.

Now all sciences except the social sciences have achieved their status as subjects of great value by studying facts with a view toward eventually achieving a synthesis, a generalization, a hypothesis, a theory, or a law which would either be of value in practice—enable mankind to deal with problems hitherto unsolvable, or which would enable mankind to predict future occurrences to some extent. History, as it is taught, does none of these things.

Other sciences have proceeded to build their laws and theories by first accumulating data, classifying it, and then eventually making some generalization. Other sciences are full of careful definitions, axioms, laws, classifications. History is not.

History is a hodge podge of data. It's in a worse mess than biology was before Darwin. We have not got much beyond the data-gathering of the medieval chroniclers except that we are more careful about the accuracy of the data.

Of course, modern historians search for causes. But if these causes are not related to present-day problems, consciously applied to the problems of the day—what good has it done to search out the causes of events? What *utility* does such a study have? What if I do know why Rome fell? In itself, of what value is that knowledge, unrelated to the present day? Don't students have a right to complain

about a history for history's sake type of attitude?

I am not opposed to pure research. And certainly some pure research, as in astronomy, may be remotely connected, or not at all, with mankind's problems. But even the astronomers do a better job of explaining the implications of their studies on the future of mankind than the historians do. The point is, that the study of history is full of much greater *possibilities* for helping mankind solve its problems than is astronomy. For that is precisely what history is,—a study of mankind's problems.

Essentially, what I am asking for is a return to some of the nineteenth and eighteenth century spirit in the study of history, when historians were still influenced by scientific thinking. The twentieth century, in reaction against the crude determinisms of the nineteenth (racial, geographic, religious, and economic determinisms), has thrown out the scientific spirit along with the crudities.

Today we hear, "The social sciences are scientific as long as the research methods are scientific." But if the research comes up with no useful generalizations, it simply results in more research. That is research for the sake of research but not for the sake of the betterment of mankind's lot.

There are those who argue, "But we cannot be scientific about history. We cannot experiment. Personality and psychology enter into the picture. There are too many unpredictables. There is multiple causation." So at a time when social problems are threatening to destroy us all, the students of society state with mighty erudition, "History is very complex." And they arrive at the sophisticated corollary that it teaches us nothing.

Certainly it is true that historical generalizations cannot have the same rigidity and permanence as do the generalizations dealing with inanimate matter. But neither are historical generalizations completely invalid. And before the teacher can preach the value and necessity of history, he must be convinced of its value and necessity himself. He must be convinced that he *can* draw useful conclusions, valuable generalizations, and "learn the lessons" of history.

But if the teacher gives lip service to history's value at the beginning of the year,

casually mentioning that "one must know the past to understand the present," and then plunges into historical data, terms of treaties, details of battles and wars, names and numbers of kings—he is being dishonest to the students and to himself. He doesn't really believe himself that the past is essential in understanding the present, or else he is not sure how to go about making the connection. He knows that the students *must* learn the names and numbers of the kings—and he threatens them with low grades or failure if they don't learn the data.

Well, a baseball fan may know the names and numbers of the baseball players, but I could be a perfectly good citizen without knowing them. Could I be a good citizen without knowing the details about ancient monarchs? The teacher is often looking at history from the point of view that it is a pleasant and interesting hobby for the teacher. Something else to do besides having an interest in golf, or being a baseball fan. He is as immersed in the loves of Henry VIII or Catherine the Great as the movie fan is immersed in the loves of Rita Hayworth or Marilyn Monroe. But then why should all his students and all good citizens practice *his* particular hobby? Why not be a movie fan?

But the point is that history *is* necessary to good citizenship. The point is that one *cannot* understand the present without knowing the past. But teachers must take this principle and put it on a new plane of importance and deal with it honestly. The teacher himself must be greatly concerned with trying to understand the present, and avoid becoming a stuffy old fuddy-duddy completely immersed in the past. He should be immersed in the *present*. And when he teaches history he must give current problems a big new emphasis, a constant and recurring emphasis throughout the course.

For if history is divorced from current events; from sociology and problems of social disorganization today; from political science and problems of changes in our government; from philosophy and questions of the nature of human nature—why we are here and where we are going—it becomes barren and dead.

Teachers must make the attempt to constantly draw lessons, conclusions, and generali-

zations from history. Teachers must do this themselves, for the textbook will not do it. And though many writers of history from ancient times to the present have "lessons of history" scattered through their works, there is no handbook of historical generalizations for the teacher to turn to. Modern historians are concerned with writing artistically, cleverly, accurately—but not with applying the lessons of the past to the problems of the present in a conscious, scientific manner. The teacher is on his own.

And after all, even if the generalizations the teacher makes are not world-shaking conclusions of genius, it is better to make the attempt to apply the past to the present rather than just *talk* about doing it, saying it is a noble *idea*, but never actually doing it. Certainly historical students have as much right to make this attempt at generalizing as do non-students of history who make generalizations all the time: no military man makes a good president, the world is going to the dogs because man has turned away from religion, there have always been wars and always will be, the woman's place is in the home, etc.

The lessons of history will not suggest themselves automatically from the facts of history; generalization is a creative process of inductive and deductive thinking.

In conclusion I wish to say that history may be taught from other angles than a stress on current social, political, and economic problems. It may be taught from the approach of cultural traditions, literary value, biographical value, ethical value, etc.

I am not opposed to any of these views and indeed I believe they are essential and should be incorporated into the type of course I'm emphasizing. But from the point of view of utility and necessity (and therefore from the point of view of motivation) history should be taught with the aim of attempting to solve social problems. It is these social problems that are mankind's biggest problems, and yet social science is his weakest science in terms of results, and useful conclusions.

I believe then, that these proposals are not only concerned with a matter of improving a science or pedagogical techniques, but also a matter of improving society.

Tips for Travel

ETHEL S. BEER

New York, New York

One evening when I was sitting in a hotel lobby in Naples, a young man who had crossed on the same steamer dashed in.

"Oh, hello," he said, "we're off tomorrow."

"Off where?" I asked.

"Well, I think we're going to Pompeii, Sorrento and I don't know where else. Mrs. Lee's hiring the car. So of course she's doing the planning." Mrs. Lee, a wealthy widow of uncertain age, had also been on the boat.

"That's fine," I said aloud. But I thought to myself. "Kind of a vague way to travel."

Yet this young man—a college teacher—was no exception.

"A new generation has grown up, who couldn't travel because of the War. So they don't know anything about it," Mrs. Wise, a veteran globe-trotter, explained.

But I am not sure that this tells the whole story. Travel is an enriching experience only if you put in a great deal yourself. This includes planning beforehand as well as during the trip, besides a knowledge of the background and familiarity with practical details. To fully benefit from travel takes time and energy, which not everybody realizes. Travel has many facets, appealing to divergent tastes. But you must have some aim, general or specific.

In planning for a trip abroad the first step is to analyze your motive. Unless you are genuinely interested in people, scenery, art, history, or foreign atmosphere, travel probably will fall short of your expectations.

Some sort of goal acts as a control. Otherwise you will flounder around and see a great deal which will leave no impression. To be sure you may want to investigate a special field.

Mrs. Bache—a keen-faced lawyer—was on the ship with me going round the world. But instead of leaving the boat for further travel as the other passengers did, she stayed on for

the entire voyage. Even in the ports she confined herself to the law courts, because she was gathering information for a book. Obviously she acquired a different slant about each country than the ordinary tourist.

To have a particular purpose of this kind adds zest to travel, as I know from my observations of social service. Due to this I have made many pleasant contacts and even occasional friends. The warmth of human beings colors my memories of various far-away lands. However, such an objective can be too circumscribed. Besides not everybody has a decided bent to guide his wanderings. Some crave a complete change from their work-a-day life with pleasure as the goal.

Seeking enjoyment from travel is natural. Being footloose under an alien sky has fascination. But a catch exists. If you look on travel as an endless round of gaiety, such as you can find at home, it seems better to stay there. To pursue amusements with an American tang, to go only with Americans, is hardly reason for taking a trip. Going abroad should mean more than just saying that you have been there.

If you are free to travel at any time, out of season has definite advantages. With fewer sight-seers milling around, the atmosphere stands out more clearly. Accommodations are cheaper and easier to procure. Hence ordinarily they do not have to be booked ahead. To be a lone stranger in a foreign land is thrilling. The inhabitants blend into the scene naturally.

Nevertheless aesthetic conditions matter, too. "I can't get over how different Italy looks now from in the Fall," I remarked again and again last summer. The contrast in the appearance of the buildings was astounding. The bright sunlight tinted them cream, while before they had appeared dull grey, blending with the overcast skies.

To some extent the length of time controls the program. Only the temptation is to cover as much ground as possible. The difficulty is that when sights rush by helter-skelter, confusion grips the mind.

Lucy—a teen-age girl—broke away from her group to join friends for a week in Florence.

"I just had to catch my breath somewhere," she exploded. "We were hurrying so much I couldn't make head or tail out of anything."

Because travelling quickly is frustrating, concentrating on a single country or region gives deeper satisfaction, especially on a first trip to a continent as varied as Europe. At least, be reasonably thorough about the greater part of your journey, which means including more than the tourist haunts.

However, do not try to see too much anywhere. Far better to skip a few land-marks and works of art, than to recollect only a hopeless blur of sights. Even in churches and museums all the details are impossible to remember. Therefore select a few and pass by the rest. Naturally this requires knowledge of the worthwhile and the mediocre beforehand.

When my nephew and I visited the Certosa di Pavia, an old monastery now a National Museum, near Milan, we finished long before the others in our group. The reason was that they had stopped in every chapel, while we only hit the high spots.

"Did you come here for air?" the guide inquired, when he discovered us waiting on a bench outside. His lips curled sarcastically.

"No," I replied, "we saw all we wished and then left."

His expression changed immediately. He smiled broadly. In his heart of heart he sensed that the tourists could never assimilate all that he showed them. As soon as you realize that clear impressions are the result of careful forethought and not crowding your time too full, you will approach travel intelligently.

Preparation for any trip takes reading and study. Both background and history are vital to understand the problems of today. In the broad canvas of the past are connections with all subjects, which is not always understood.

"I'm only interested in economics and music," claimed Jerry, a college youth. "So why stay in Florence and look at pictures?" He shrugged

his shoulders disdainfully. Yet Florence was built by bankers and the guilds, and many of the artistic treasures are the result of their patronage.

Besides the ordinary sources of information, such as books, articles, travelogs, and material from tourist agencies, a hotel guide is issued by some foreign state departments and sold over here. This lists hotels for that country, classifies them, and quotes the legal price. But unless you have the last edition—which I did not—the rate is only approximate. Foreign railroads, too, have offices in the United States where it is worth asking whether the complete time-table is available. In various European nations, these are published once a month and probably can be consulted here, if not bought. Newspaper stands sell them over there. Although these time-tables use the 24-hour day, they are quite easy to follow. And they help judge time and distance.

Generally speaking, European reservations do not have to be made on this side of the water, except for the port of landing or first stop. A letter or wire a few days ahead is a precaution. At least, this works with non "de luxe" hotels. Government travel bureaus, such as Switzerland runs, will make arrangements for you. Thomas Cook's and the American Express are everywhere, besides the local travel agencies. The porter—a real factotum in every hotel—will engage rooms, recommend hotels, and attend to tickets of all kinds. Not booking until on the spot allows for more flexibility of program.

Mr. and Mrs. Best who were travelling with their adolescent daughter, had all their rooms reserved before leaving the United States, although they were not on a regular tour.

"And when we arrived in Rome a day late, we had an awful time. The hotel had nothing for us," stated Mrs. Best. "Now we don't dare change." She sighed. A fixed schedule can be irksome.

Either a Letter of Credit or Traveller's Checks are the most practical way to carry money. Usually a Letter of Credit is not advised for a short stay. Traveller's Checks are issued by the American Express as well as Thomas Cook's, and probably can be purchased at your own bank. Denominations of \$10, \$20,

and \$50 are useful. To calculate closely before crossing each border is harder without the \$10 checks, as I found to my regret last summer. Single dollars—say 20 - 50—are handy for emergencies. Because they brought a high rate of exchange, one youth we met carried all his funds in cash, spreading as much as \$500 around in his suitcases, a rather inconvenient and risky performance.

A small sum of foreign money is advisable for landing purposes. Probably some can be procured from the Purser on the boat. But as his supply is limited, it is better to take it from home. Money is not needed for all the countries you expect to visit. I state this because I saw two girls buying different foreign kinds, when I purchased my Italian lire in New York. Exchanging as you progress is simpler. Most hotels offer this service, which is a convenience particularly in paying the bill, although they may give slightly less than the banks. The street vendors usually allow the most. But they may deal in counterfeit money or trick you with packages of blank paper.

In regard to baggage, travel as lightly as possible. Trunks are a nuisance and costly to send from place to place. Valises, though roomy, should fit in the racks on trains. Buses generally put them on the roof or in a trailer behind. Airplanes have their own arrangements. An overflow bag serves for short side trips, when larger suitcases can be left gratis in many hotels in Europe.

Take as few clothes as you dare, allowing for the season and the weather. Because climate varies so much, even in the same latitude, remember to check it beforehand. Formal attire is not a "must" on land or the steamer for that matter. Certainly girls do not have to have a different gown for every evening at sea, as many do. At the most a few street dresses and one or two for evening should suffice. Men do not need full dress. Suits of all weights are practical for women. Palm beach clothes and seersucker are fine for both sexes in summer. Cotton voile is very cool for dresses. Of course, nylon has revolutionized women's wardrobe and men's to some extent because it dries so quickly and does not need pressing. This diminishes the laundry problem, which exists even in the Latin European countries—

where service is quick and efficient—because of the one-night stops on trips. Be sure to have enough comfortable shoes, as American feet are hard to fit abroad. In many European hotels, shoes are shined free and should be put outside your door at night.

Travelling by air saves time. But ocean voyages still hold glamour. Young people have a gay time aboard a ship in all classes, although many prefer cabin and tourist. Small ships are more intimate. In Europe railroad coaches, second or third class according to country, are most comfortable. Going first class is unnecessary and not as sociable. Whenever possible, seat reservations should be made ahead for long trips. Regular buses frequently accept valises and are more reasonable than the "de luxe" type, besides being less patronized by tourists. A private car allows for more stops. But hiring one is expensive, while an amateur has to be expert for the twisty roads of Europe. Bicycle tours can be arranged and are reasonable.

The temptation to take a taxi in a strange place is great. But local buses or trams are preferable in order to learn the lay-out of the streets. Walking, though tiring, is best of all. A map facilitates finding the way, particularly if you have a good bump of direction.

Luxurious hotels abound in Europe and most other travelled parts today. However, others offer conveniences, too. A private bath is harder to obtain with a single room than a double. But running water in every room is common in Europe now. Or the quarters may include a combination of wash-basin and toilet. Towels are provided but not soap. Using the public bath costs extra.

When meals are served, a pension rate can be arranged for a few days stay, either for two or three meals. In season some hotels insist on this plan, which is too bad because exploring the restaurants is fun, and according to my experience often cheaper. Of course pension rates amount to less than paying for each meal in the hotel. Certain hotels serve only breakfast, either in your room or downstairs. To our amusement, in Rome we ate it in the bar. Breakfast may be included in the price of your room, as in England and less often on the continent. Pensions, said to be

good and reasonable, function all over Europe. Youth hostels are the least dear and are patronized by numerous young people.

Although food is more expensive than formerly in Europe, there is no need to go to the luxurious restaurants. A cover charge is more or less habitual. Continental fare has returned to its pre-war level of tastiness. In England breakfast is a really substantial meal in the smaller hotels, where I go, at any rate. And of course, the famous afternoon tea is most delicious. To some extent American dishes and soft drinks have invaded Italy and France. While these assuage a home-sick palate occasionally, native cooking is too delicious to miss.

Tipping—the bane of every traveller's existence—has been abolished in restaurants and hotels in various parts of Europe. Instead a service charge is added to the bill. Occasionally hotels hide this in the total because Americans object, I was told. Although there is a legal rate per bag for porters, more is expected. Be warned, though, that overtipping causes as much kicking as undertipping, a fact not always known.

Roughly, travel consists of places and people. Finding your way around brings contacts with human beings that do not occur with a guide. The ticket agent, in Naples, who stopped to draw a map to show us how the train went; the policeman in Perugia, who came off his post to give us directions to the Museum; the many "men on the street" who with unfailing politeness showed us the way, have left as vivid impressions as the sights. Americans have nothing to fear in travel.

"But you know other languages besides English," people say, when I mention the simplicity of travel. True enough. But I have visited many corners of the earth, including the Orient, where I did not understand a word. Yet I had no great difficulty. Today English has spread to most of the travelled world. Time and again I have been answered in my own tongue on trips abroad, because all wanted to practice. And friends of mine told me that they never learned French the whole three years they were in Belgium for the same reason.

To become socially acquainted is another story. Usually Americans greet one another familiarly and strike up some sort of relationship. Meeting other English-speaking individuals is comparatively easy, too. Occasionally foreign travellers will converse with you. Even the reserve of the inhabitants can be overcome sometimes. Any encounter—no matter how superficial—particularly with foreigners, adds up to the good because it is broadening.

The ideal is to visit in homes and see intimate living. But in my experience a formal introduction is essential in Latin lands. On the contrary the Greeks are more hospitable. Also, I still have friends after years, met casually in Australia and New Zealand. To be sure social service opens many doors for me. One of the pleasantest afternoons we spent one summer in Italy was at the famous boys' Republic of Santa Marinella near Rome, where former street urchins are trained. Any side-light of this kind increases the value of the trip.

Many Americans hesitate to travel alone. Undeniably there are lonesome moments. But compensations exist, too. You are your own boss. Strangers approach you more readily. Not preoccupied with anyone, your senses are more keenly attuned to the foreign atmosphere. Of course a congenial companion is fun, too. And you can live over the experience together afterwards. Only be sure that you have an understanding about personal matters, such as sharing rooms, making dates, and pursuing your own interests. As for a group, this confines you almost entirely to your own compatriots, which is not too broadening. This does not apply to the Experiments in International Living, which places young men and women in foreign homes. However, even in these all arrangements are made for you, thus cutting out an important part of learning how to travel. Nor is this as formidable as you may think.

In the last analysis travel depends on your own attitude. It is an eye-opener only if you are willing to work towards this end. Like most worth-while things in life the joy of travel is not a free gift. To know as much as you can beforehand eases the path. Learning by doing cements the experience.

A Philosophy of Government

ROY LECHTRECK

Creve Coeur, Missouri

Although the presidential election will not occur until November, we Americans are already experiencing one of the unique traits of the *homo americanus*. We are in the midst of an election campaign, with all of its noisy rallies, comic and tragic promises, mud slinging—and quiet thought.

We should not forget this last item. To many people both here and abroad, the election campaign is simply the hoopla of an immature people. To some it is corrupt and to others it is sleight-of-tongue nonsense. Party conventions are preceded by mock party conventions, and party platforms by mock party platforms. The assistance of a party before the vote is cast, so this theory goes, is always based on the assumption that the giver will be materially rewarded after his party has won.

Actually this account is only half true, and because of that it seems more like a page taken from *Alice in Wonderland* or *Gulliver's Travels* than an account of real life. There is much more to American party battles than a dispute over whether eggs (taxes) should be cracked (collected) at one end (as income) or the other end (as corporate profits) which we may recall caused the Lilliputians in *Gulliver's Travels* to go to war with their neighbors. This is only the foam on the top of the beer, and there is much more to the glass than the foam. More often than not an election is a test of the strength of two different philosophies of government—different ideas on what government should or should not do. The election of a man is more than just the selection of a certain pair of hands and legs to an office. Rather, it is a selection of a belief or philosophy of government, with the pair of hands and legs tagging along.

This is the way it has been throughout most of our history. The choice of Thomas Jefferson

in 1800 was the first of many instances of this. His victory over the Federalists showed that the people desired more states' rights and less promotion of business interests to the detriment of agricultural interests. After a few decades, the business interests were again in the saddle, and this time the people threw them out with the election of Andy Jackson. In the campaign of 1800 the issue was whether the business aristocracy or the agricultural aristocracy was better fitted to rule. When Jackson ran for the Presidency the issue was whether the business aristocracy or the common man should rule.

True, these struggles were between conflicting interests, but behind these conflicting interests were conflicting ideologies. This is borne out by the fact that many of the candidates in these political battles seemed to be on the wrong side of the fence. Jackson, an advocate of the interests of the common man, was a member of the upper classes. Franklin D. Roosevelt also was a member of the upper classes, but one can hardly say that he advocated their interests over those of the lower classes. More often it seems that a man's ideology shapes his interests rather than the opposite.

The Roosevelt-Hoover campaign was a good example of this. Not only was F. D. R. a member of the upper classes, by birth, but Hoover was a member of the poorer classes, by birth. His belief in the principles that have made him famous existed long before he became wealthy and, in fact, actually were the causes of his wealth. A sincere man, as Hoover was, could not have become as wealthy as he did if he did not believe in the philosophy of rugged individualism.

That election of 1932 was a rejection of the principles of Hoover, namely, that rugged individualism was the only economic way of life

for Americans. The next four elections were also a rejection of that philosophy and an approval of the New Deal. In 1952 things changed. The people did not want to retrench and abolish what the last two decades had accomplished. For that reason they refused to nominate Taft for the Presidency because they thought that he was too conservative. Nor did they want more of the Fair Deal, for if they did they would have voted for the man from Illinois. Basically, they desired to continue what they had without much change in either direction, and they elected the man from Abilene.

Personalities, of course, do play a part in every election, but they play a significant part only if other factors are about equally balanced. Much more important than personalities are philosophies. In fact, it is often the very philosophy of government of the candidate that makes his personality attractive or repulsive to a voter. A good political personality is never out of step with the times. Norman Thomas, Eugene Debs, and many others were anathema to the average voter, not because of the personality which the voter knew nothing about, but because of their political philosophy which the people disliked.

The philosophies of government presented to the voters by the major parties in presidential election campaigns are seldom as basically different as they were in the Roosevelt-Hoover campaign. For when that happens, one of the parties is out of step with the times. But it does not at all follow from this that there are no differences between what the two parties stand for in our national government. It is only the minor parties that have no hope of winning elections that are willing to consistently be out of step with the times, for their program is not the winning of votes but the promulgation of a program.

The existence of different philosophies of government requires all thoughtful Americans to determine which of the two at any particular time comes closer to what they conceive of as an ideal political philosophy. If the election was only an election of one person or another to office, the voter's decision as to which person he should vote for would be decided as to who he thought was the better man. But since a presidential election is more than that—since

it is also a selection between two different philosophies, the voter must not only decide as to the better candidate but he must also decide as to the better philosophy.

The basic question which all political philosophies seek to answer is, "What should be the purpose of the government?" For Western man there seems to be only one good answer. The purpose of any government should be the general welfare of the people. A government is for the people, not for an economic class. Nor is it the promoter of any particular religion or way of life. It is a servant of all the people, a tool to be used by them in improving themselves and their descendants. It is a thing subject to the people. Otherwise it has no right to the loyalty of all the people.

If at any particular time the needs of the people are great, then the government must also be great—as strong and as comprehensive as are the needs of the people. Lincoln had a very good criteria as to what the state should do. He held that the government is to do that which the people cannot do themselves or cannot do as effectively themselves through voluntary cooperation. The power and magnitude of the government is as great or as small as the gap, between what the people are doing and what needs to be done, is seen to be. If a minority of the people refuse to do what is generally recognized as necessary, then government intervention must take place, and that intervention is necessary wherever a minority takes an obstructionist attitude against the common good. For what separates a truly democratic government from all other institutions of man is its ability, accepted throughout history, to enforce the legitimate wishes of the people, if voluntary action fails to do the job. When the people are unable to protect themselves from a strong minority in their legitimate social activities, whether because of their economic status, religion, or race, then the legal sanctions of the local, state, or national government must lend a helping hand.

This philosophy of government is, admittedly, semi-idealistic. It is only meant to be a standard by which we should judge political questions in the light of the political maturity of the people. The more mature a people are, the fewer needs of the people will be left unfilled by the government. Progress results not

in depriving the government of its functions in the hope that man will become better—for man is not built that way. Instead, progress results in the society as a whole undertaking to meet its needs, rather than relying on each man to look out for himself. Progress lies in collective self-control rather than individual anarchy.

True liberty and freedom, arising only when the people are not in economic want and not being discriminated against, depends on the welfare of the people. A people without security cannot be free. It is not a curtailment of any-

one's freedom to require him to use his wealth and influence in the interests of his fellow man.

We should no longer tolerate a group of mankind enjoying only second class welfare. Toynbee once remarked that several hundred years from now, the Twentieth Century will be known not for its wars, inventions or discoveries, but for having "been the first age since the dawn of civilization in which people dared to think it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available for the whole human race."

Compulsory Military Training As a Social Good

By RICHARD C. BROWN

New York State University College for Teachers, Buffalo, N. Y.

Military service has never been particularly popular in the United States. Our citizens have tended to regard it as a necessary evil, even in time of war. For this reason, military training has always been hard to "sell" to the American people. We consented to the principle of Selective Service during World War I and have reluctantly consented to Selective Service in one form or another during the international crises of the past fifteen years. But we have never accepted compulsory military training for our youth.

In securing members of our armed forces both in war and peace time, those concerned with recruiting have stressed the material benefits of joining the colors. Our servicemen have invariably been the best paid in the world and our veterans the most liberally rewarded. Especially since World War I, however, there has been a very strong movement to stress the intangible benefits of military service and this has been most marked in the effort to point up the social benefits of compulsory military training. Of course, the principal argument advanced for the adoption of compulsory military training is National Defense. It is argued that we need a large reservoir of at least par-

tially trained men in order to defend ourselves effectively. But this is not the only argument that has been advanced for CMT. There are many others: The Preparedness argument, the Democratic argument, the Historical argument, the Pioneer argument, the Health argument, the Integrating argument, the Character Building argument, the Moral argument, and the Vocational argument—all these have been advanced by the military and civilian supporters of compulsory military training.

The origins of the movement to stress the social good of military training can be traced to an article written by a young Army captain, Merch B. Stewart, in 1905. Captain Stewart called his article, "The Army as a Factor in the Upbuilding of Society."¹ He stressed the fact that military service would result in the physical and moral improvement of the individual, would inspire a more profound respect for and obedience to the law, and concluded, "If we are to believe that sturdy physiques and sound personal principles are valuable assets in the manhood of a nation, the conclusion seems to point persistently to something akin, at least, to the military training of our youth."² Slowly at first, but more rapidly as World War

I approached, civilian and military leaders began to take up Stewart's line of reasoning—that military service could be of great social benefit to the individual and to the nation. This type of argument has been somewhat overshadowed during the past fifteen years because supporters of CMT have based their main support on the dangerous state of the international situation. But if international tensions ease, as there seems to be some prospect of their doing, then we may expect that arguments stressing the social good to be derived from CMT will be advanced with increasing frequency.

The Preparedness argument says that CMT will actually prevent war, as no aggressor would risk national suicide by attacking us if we had a large force of trained men built up by compulsory military training. The Preparedness argument also has an individual facet. Statistics show that well trained servicemen suffer far fewer casualties and deaths than do raw recruits. Thus the Preparedness argument states that compulsory military training acts as a social good both to the nation and to the individual. It may actually keep us out of war and, in the event we do get involved in a war, it will help to save the lives of millions of individuals.

The Democratic argument and the Integrating argument for compulsory military training are somewhat related. The Democratic argument runs that CMT is thoroughly in keeping with our democratic principles and that military service is one of the most potent experiences in democratic living that an individual could undergo. Social, religious, political, economic and ethnic differences matter little and disappear beneath the leveling effect of the national uniform. Rich man, poor man, Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Democrat, Republican, first and tenth generation Americans all serve together. They eat the same food, sleep in the same type of quarters, wear the same uniform and in no other line of endeavor is advancement based more clearly on merit than in the military services.

In advancing the Integrating argument, supporters of compulsory military training list all the factors tending toward disunity and conflict in the United States. They point to the sectional diversity, the economic, social, ethnic and religious diversity of the American people

and decry the lack of any strongly unifying factor. Although other observers may find this unifying factor in our language, our government or some other aspect of our national heritage, CMT supporters insist that these are not enough. What better means can there be of integrating the American people into one homogeneous whole, they ask, than having every youth devote a portion of his life to the national service?

The Historical argument is used in many ways to support compulsory military training. Some have pointed to those ancient models for the American republic, the Greek city-states and the Roman Republic, as states in which every citizen felt it his duty to protect the state by undergoing military training as part of his education. General Hugh L. Scott stated it this way, "Universal military training has been the corner stone upon which has been built every republic in the history of the world, and its abandonment the signal for decline and obliteration."³

Those wishing to apply the Historical argument for CMT to American history have pointed out that all our victories in war have been accomplished at great cost in lives and money. These losses could have been lessened, they say, had our youth been militarily prepared.⁴ It has also been argued that the Founding Fathers actually meant to establish the proposition of CMT in the Militia Law of 1792 which stated "that each and every free, able-bodied, white male citizen of the respective States . . . who is or shall be of the age of eighteen years, and under the age of forty-five years . . . shall be enrolled in the militia . . ."⁵

It is a commonplace to observe that the United States has changed from a predominantly rural nation to an overwhelmingly urban nation. As short a time as a century ago most men, women and children were familiar with firearms and with life in the outdoors. As Lieutenant Roy Winton expressed this thought in the *Infantry Journal*, "the hard lives and consequent firm characters of the pioneers of the United States kept the national spirit high . . . the race was lusty and strong."⁶ Many observers have regretted our loss of this pioneer background; they claim that we have become soft and have lost much of our independence and sturdy individuality. Now, a high

proportion of our population would find it difficult to load, aim, and fire a firearm unaided, and would probably starve or succumb swiftly to disease if forced to live out-of-doors for any length of time. Supporters of compulsory military training use the Pioneer argument to contend that we can restore a valuable portion of our national heritage by subjecting every youth to a period of military training during which he would learn to handle firearms and to care for himself in primitive surroundings without the conveniences of twentieth-century civilization.

That military service builds good character is one of the favorite assertions of those who support compulsory military training. They stress the stabilizing effect of military discipline and the wholesome respect for authority, law and order which military service induces. Furthermore, military service may reveal latent talents for leadership and develop any talent for leadership possessed by an individual. Any day now the Character Building argument for compulsory military training may be used as an antidote for juvenile delinquency.

The physical and mental deficiencies of World War I and World War II selectees furnished potent support for the Health argument for compulsory military training. The great number of young men who could not meet the physical and mental standards set up by the Selective Service officials startled and appalled many thoughtful persons. It was observed that many of the physical and mental defects could have been eliminated if discovered sooner. The Health argument for CMT asks, why not, through the means of compulsory military training, have every youth submit himself to a physical and mental examination at the age of eighteen? "For all men it would furnish an opportunity to have detected and corrected certain pathological tendencies, which in many cases would be easily remedied if discovered in time; also, compulsory military training would give better health through instruction for all in personal hygiene."⁷

General Thomas M. Anderson put the Moral argument for compulsory military training succinctly in these words, "If it be true that all men are endowed with equal rights, does it not follow that they are charged with correlative duties."⁸ This argument suggests that military

service to the government is a duty owed by all who receive the benefits bestowed upon them by the government of our state. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States at one time held a referendum on this question and got overwhelming support from its members for this resolution: "Recognizing the military obligation equally with the civic obligation as a fundamental duty of democratic citizenship . . . we recommend that compulsory military training be adopted as a fundamental democratic principle of our military policy and be enforced by law."⁹

The statement that you can learn a trade in the Army, Navy, or Air Force has been part of millions of recruiting posters. Supporters of compulsory military training have also used this Vocational argument to point out that the trainee can often re-enter civilian life at least partly trained for a life-time vocation. It has been pointed out, too, that the servicemen of World War I and World War II included within their ranks a large number of illiterates who were too old or otherwise unable to attend school. Military service gave them an excellent opportunity to learn to read and write. For the more educationally advanced, it is possible to secure high school credits and diplomas and even college credits while in military service through correspondence courses and on-base instruction. Thus the Vocational argument states that compulsory military training could well become a gigantic and socially useful experiment in adult education.

These are the arguments advanced by those who regard compulsory military training as a social good. They should interest social studies teachers and administrators, for there are startling parallels between these arguments and those advanced by supporters of compulsory public education.¹⁰ Early advocates of free, compulsory education stressed its character aspects and the fact that it would combat illiteracy. The public schools have been acclaimed as experiences in democratic living and for their national integrating effect. Health and vocational education are now part of every public school curriculum. Camping and nature education are playing an increasing role, and social studies teachers often stress the moral duty of the good citizen to be informed.

At different times in the world's history, religious leaders, warriors, politicians, businessmen and teachers have assumed responsibility for leadership in the society in which they exist. Ever since these groups have come into existence as specialized contributors to civilization there has been a swing to or away from one group or the other. In the relatively short history of the United States the military man has not occupied a very prominent place in the hierarchy of social leadership. We have placed our faith in other groups.

With the advent of the twentieth century, however, the United States has engaged in world-wide wars that have necessitated our adoption of the nation-in-arms technique. This has brought the military establishment into a new position of leadership, for the logical concomitant of the nation-in-arms is to give the military establishment a much larger voice in the political, social and economic life of the nation even in time of peace. If every citizen is to contribute in the front lines, the laboratory, the factory, or on the farm in time of war, then common sense would have it that some preparation and training should be given our citizens in peace time. Our young people, faced with the prospects of military service, are asking an

increasing number of questions about it. We need to inform ourselves, for their questions and the contentions of our military leaders must be answered. If the arguments for the social good of compulsory military training are accepted, as they were accepted as reasons for the establishment of a compulsory educational system, then we will witness another step in the rise of the military leader to a position of social leadership in the United States.

¹ Capt. Merch B. Stewart, "The Army as a Factor in the Upbuilding of Society," *Journal of the Military Service Institute*, Vol. 36, 1905, pp. 391-404.

² *Ibid*, p. 397.

³ War Department Annual Reports, 1916, "Report of the Chief of Staff," p. 161.

⁴ General Emory Upton, *The Military Policy of the United States*, Senate Document No. 494 (Washington, 1912).

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 84; War Department Annual Reports, 1916, "Report of the Chief of Staff," pp. 162-63.

⁶ Lt. Roy W. Winton, "The Problem of Patriotism," *Infantry Journal*, Vol. 9, 1912-13, p. 773.

⁷ House of Representative Hearings, "Army Reorganization, 1919-20," Vol. I, pp. 1212-13.

⁸ General Thomas M. Anderson, "Universal Military Service," *Journal of the Military Service Institute*, Vol. 43, 1908, p. 25.

⁹ Senate Hearings, "Universal Military Training, 1916-17," pp. 718-19.

¹⁰ Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators* (New York, 1935) describes in interesting detail the social arguments used by advocates and supporters of a free, compulsory school system.

The United Nations' Debt to the League of Nations

E. W. THORNTON

Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma

The tenth anniversary of the United Nations also marks the thirty-sixth year since the launching of the League of Nations, the world's first serious attempt at collective security. Most American reflections on the United Nations give the general impression that man's efforts toward world organization date exclusively from 1945. A more accurate picture results from viewing the entire period since 1919 as a single epoch rather than two separate and rather unrelated episodes. The United Nations phase is an extension of the earlier one. It

represents continuity rather than a break in history.

The American tendency to ignore the League stems naturally from the fact that the United States was not a member of it. Its headquarters were in Europe, with leadership drawn largely from European countries. The history of the League also coincides with a period of isolationist sentiment in America. Moreover, after the mid-thirties the prestige of the League sank to the vanishing point, and American success psychology now forbids the associating of

present efforts with the failures of the League. The United Nations, on the other hand, was born in America, has its headquarters here, and has been a prominent factor in American public opinion. The first decade of United Nations history has also seen the full acceptance of world responsibility by the United States. In the League era we rejected the One World concept; with World War II we became global-minded and accepted world leadership. To the average American the League suggests frustration while the United Nations denotes hope if not achievement.

In spite of these attitudes the total period provides a better frame of reference for evaluating the United Nations than the single decade since 1945. The present organization is essentially the League of Nations revived and revised.¹ The fundamental problems of 1945 had been faced in 1919 and the basic outline of world organization which emerged at Paris was retained at San Francisco. The authors of the United Nations Charter did endeavor to profit from the experience of the nineteen-thirties. Their work also reflects a more realistic outlook than that which prevailed at the close of the First World War. But if for no other reason, the United Nations, coming *after* the League episode, was shaped and influenced by it.

It is possible to point out numerous instances in which the United Nations took over and continued many of the activities of its predecessor. For example, the United Nations Charter incorporated the World Court practically intact. The Secretariat, too, was re-established, while the Trusteeship arrangement was patterned along the line of the former Mandate System, the latter receiving specific mention in the Charter. Various specialized agencies already existing under League auspices were brought into relationship with the United Nations according to Charter provisions. In both organization and procedure the League contributed much to the new effort. In one sense it may be said that the San Francisco Conference of 1945 was merely a convention for the purpose of drawing up a new constitution for the world organization. The former Covenant was superseded by the Charter, the name was changed, and a new membership roll was composed, including most of the former

members with a few additions, notably the United States.

But such observations as the above are matters of interpretation. Their relevancy depends on whether we choose to consider the League as completely non-existent by 1945 or merely inactive. A more pertinent consideration is the fact that the central characteristic of our age, politically speaking, dominates the entire period of League-United Nations history. National sovereignty, the same stubborn "fact of life" which plagued the efforts of the League, remained to confront the statesmen who assembled for a new start in 1945. And just as national sovereignty determined the limits of League authority in the nineteen-twenties and -thirties, so also it has set the bounds of effective action by the United Nations in the forties and fifties. Any attempt to organize the present world must address itself to this problem, whether it be along the lines of the League of Nations or according to the modified pattern of the United Nations. Modern nationalism determines the climate of all our efforts at international cooperation and thus provides a basic unity to the twentieth-century experimentation in that field.

Such continuity is manifested in the first place in the Charter itself. The realists at San Francisco wrote into the document that "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members." Then with true logic a second principle followed, stating that "All members . . . shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them." The Charter thereby gave cognizance to the basic lesson of the League experiment: Given the sovereignty of the member states, the efforts of the organization will depend mainly on good faith, that is, the voluntary cooperation rather than coercion of the members. The fact had already been recognized in the League Covenant in various ways, such as the provision that decisions of the Council should be unanimous unless otherwise stated. This principle of unanimity was retained in the Charter (except on procedural matters), thus providing a veto power to members of the Security Council.

The veto, which has caused so much concern in the United Nations, was little used during the League period. Instead, an even more seri-

ous practice prevailed. The great powers, when disciplined by the League, simply seceded. By 1938 Japan, Germany, and Italy had withdrawn, to be followed by Spain in 1939 and the expulsion of Russia in 1940. Had Russia not possessed the veto in the Security Council of the United Nations she doubtless would have withdrawn long ago. Thus the principle of universal membership would appear to hinge on the retention of the veto in the Security Council. It is rather significant that during the San Francisco Conference the veto question came to be viewed by many as more or less irrelevant. If the great powers seriously disagree on a vital issue, it was argued, of what use is the veto power? Governments will ignore such decisions when outvoted; national sovereignty simply cancels out such academic restraints as a veto in a council. All of which merely emphasizes the fact that the veto in itself is not the fundamental ailment of the United Nations. The veto, rather, is an essential instrument for the survival of the organization. It will continue to be essential so long as the United Nations, like the League of Nations before it, remains a confederation of sovereign powers.

In setting up the provisions for maintaining peace the authors of the Charter tried to profit from the proven short-comings of the League Covenant. The chief difference in the two documents lies in the arrangements for the use of force to maintain peace and security. The Covenant provided for economic sanctions against the aggressor but stopped short of the use of military force save as a mere recommendation to the member states. In contrast, Chapter VII of the Charter not only provides for economic penalties but follows them up with elaborate arrangements for the application of military force against an aggressor. Here are the "teeth" which the League lacked and by which it was hoped to avoid the fatal weakness which had led to the breakdown of peace in the nineteen-thirties. Under this plan as originally provided in the Charter (and as it stands even yet) the Security Council was empowered to call out certain armed forces which were to have been placed at its disposal by special treaties with the various member nations. A Military Staff Committee was provided for and the Security Council was invested with military police power on a scale far

greater than that which had been granted to the League Council. These provisions were the fruit of sad experience under the League in the days of the dictators. We are sharply aware that they have been nullified by new conditions arising after 1945. Nevertheless, they constitute a reminder of the fund of experience which was freely drawn upon when the United Nations was launched.

Not only in the writing of the Charter was the influence of the League of Nations evident. The ghost of the Geneva organization has frequented the committee rooms and assemblies of the glass house in New York on various occasions. In this discussion we shall examine only one such effect on the history of the United Nations. It is the single episode which makes the United Nations experience fundamentally different from League history. This event, the Korean War, may well be the reason why the United Nations is active today at its tenth anniversary rather than dormant, as was the League by the late thirties. The difference does not arise from any difference in organization, that is, of Charter vis à vis Covenant, but from a different climate of world opinion and resulting decisions of governments. That the course of events in the summer of 1950 was deeply influenced by what had occurred in 1931 and 1935 is fairly apparent.

The great crisis of League history was faced in 1935 with the Italian invasion of Ethiopia. Economic sanctions were applied against Italy until Mussolini threatened to go to war against members of the League if oil were included in the boycott, in which event he might have received aid from Hitler. While the Covenant contained no detailed provisions for police action, it did state that, should a member resort to war in disregard of the Covenant, the Council should, after application of economic sanctions, "recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval, or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League." (Articles 16, Sections 1-2).

But in 1935 the free world was unwilling to go to war in order to prevent aggression. The United States was determined to remain neutral in Europe's troubles in addition to having no obligations of League membership. England

and France drew back from military action for various reasons, including the uncertainty over Hitler and a strong peace sentiment among the people. Besides there was the fear lest the Mussolini regime, if caused to fall, should be replaced with Communism. The upshot was the Hoare-Laval Agreement, embodying full concession to Mussolini. Although economic sanctions (excluding oil) were continued for some months, the net result was the collapse of the League of Nations. It had survived the defiance of Japan in 1931, but the Ethiopian affair was a blow from which it never recovered.

The United Nations faced a similar crisis with the Communist invasion of South Korea in the summer of 1950. As in the case of Ethiopia, an act of open aggression was committed, if not by a great power, certainly by a satellite of one. Although, as noted above, the Charter contained specific provisions which looked to the creation of adequate police power to be vested in the security Council, such power had not been placed at its disposal. The United Nations of 1950, therefore, had no more authority to deal with aggression than the League had in 1935. It could pass resolutions, it could designate the aggressor, it could authorize economic penalties and even military action, but only as recommendations to the member states. But could even that power be exercised in view of the veto held by Russia? By one of those fateful circumstances which sometimes arise in history the Russian delegation, in June of 1950, was boycotting the Security Council, although her membership status was otherwise unchanged. Hence the Security Council was able to act; North Korea was declared an aggressor and military action was urged upon the member states. The United States, having forces in Japan, and on whose initiative the action was being taken, responded at once. Naturally, the vital decisions in this move were made at Washington, but they were made in the name of the United Nations. They were made with the approval and moral support of the peoples of the free world acting through the world organization. The action has been called history's most complete example of collective security.

The war which ensued was waged in the name of the United Nations. Sixteen govern-

ments contributed military forces who fought under the United Nations flag. Over fifty nations accepted the position of belligerents; three-fourths of them sent material aid of some kind. From a practical standpoint it was admittedly a war of the United States and her allies. But from the standpoint of the United Nations ideal it meant that the lesson of 1935 had been made effective. The necessity of police force in maintaining peace was finally accepted. Aggression was being dealt with through collective action. The full implementation of the idea was not realized with the Korean episode; instead, from the standpoint of collective security this first true functioning of the League-U. N. purpose was accompanied by confusion and frustration. Such has been the case in all pioneer effort in the uncharted sea of international relations. In spite of that, Korea represents achievement in that the League of Nations dream was carried a full step forward.

A final observation on the relation of the United Nations to the preceding period has to do with the emergence of the General Assembly as the most important branch of the organization. After the return of the Soviets to the Security Council in August, 1950, it was apparent that little if any positive action dealing with aggression could be had in that body. The result was the Uniting for Peace Resolution adopted by the General Assembly in November. This now historic step constitutes in effect an interpretation of its own powers by the General Assembly, under which, if the Security Council is stymied by the veto, the General Assembly can recommend (not order) action by a two-thirds vote. This and other significant developments in the growing influence of the General Assembly merit a more extended treatment than the scope of this paper permits. The important point here is that, with the continuing failure of the idea of coercion, (a concept centered in the Security Council), the United Nations has begun to evolve along the lines of voluntary cooperation, using the General Assembly as the chief agency for doing so. In a sense it can be said that the statesmen of the United Nations have gone back to the starting point—back to the League of Nations which was lacking in "teeth." Realizing that sovereign states cannot be coerced, that they will not surrender their power of decision over

vital matters, the leaders of the United Nations have fallen back to the solid ground of recommendations rather than directives.

The Charter had vested authority and prerogative in the Security Council but had limited the General Assembly mainly to power of recommendation. Nationalism and the Cold War have invalidated the coercive power of the Security Council, but there still remains the greater power of mutual interest located in the General Assembly, greater because it more accurately corresponds with reality. The architects of the United Nations had hoped to improve on the League by vesting in the Security Council the power to make decisions and call out its own police. Experience proved that this ideal is impossible of realization in our day. But Korea and the Uniting for Peace Resolution showed that aggression maybe be successfully challenged without a centralized super-government's having "power to act." They revealed that it is more important to have unity of purpose and a willingness to wage war if need be in order to stop aggression. Such factors can be more effectively implemented through the General Assembly than the Security Council. The former provides a forum

for debate, creates as well as reflects public opinion, and has the great advantage of being a democratic gathering of all the member states. The General Assembly, therefore, is in the process of assuming the all-important function of maintaining peace and security.

Thus the most important constitutional development of United Nations history to date represents a trend back to the League of Nations rather than away from it. Can it be that the failures and frustrations caused by the Cold War, in nullifying the rigid and too ambitious authoritarianism of the Security Council, are driving us to a more realistic position based on the voluntary principle? If such be the case it represents a more logical step in the evolution of collective security than the forced growth generated by the war conditions of 1945. At the same time it tends to relate the process more naturally with the earlier development covering the present century and including the arrested but important growth under the League of Nations.

¹ See the author's article, "The League Revived and Revised." *The Social Studies*, XXXVI, 293-96 (November, 1945).

The Teachers' Page

HYMAN M. BOODISH

Dobbins Vocational-Technical School and The Junto Adult School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Among the principal objectives of all social studies teaching, the following, along with the development of good citizenship, are generally regarded as paramount:

1. Development of the power of critical thinking.
2. Acquisition of skills in problem solving.
3. Development of desirable attitudes, which may require changing existing attitudes.
4. Acquisition of information necessary for the realization of the above objectives.

What are the relative values of the lecture and group discussion in achieving these goals?

Thomas S. Stovall, writing in *Social Education*, January, 1956, reports on several experi-

mental studies concerned with this question. Although the conclusions are based largely on the work with college students and with adults, they may be significant to all levels of teaching. In general, the studies show that the lecture and group discussion "produce about equal results in the amount of information acquired by students." But, group discussion is superior to the lecture in

1. Stimulating critical thinking
2. Developing problem solving skills

Also, although "both lecture and discussion can change attitudes . . . group discussion is significantly more effective for this purpose."

Wholesale disapproval of the lecture, as a

method of teaching, is not of course, an implied conclusion of these studies. Used judiciously, the lecture can be an inspiring means of imparting information. The several investigations mentioned in the article serve to reemphasize the ever increasing recognition of the importance of the various types of group discussions in the overall learning process. This is particularly true in those areas of learning where emotional changes are desirable goals. We might add that no learning ever takes place without the emotions, in varying intensity, being somehow involved.

Every so often new words and concepts are introduced and given emphasis in educational writings and conferences. There is frequently the tendency, among people in the field of education, and it may be true in other areas of human learning, to overuse newly introduced words. The result, sometimes, is that these new terms become through overuse encrusted with emotional overtones, not always of a favorable nature. After a while they are shunned or avoided because of these negative associations.

Several years ago, the term *group dynamics* came into popular use until, in some circles, it met the fate just described. We believe sufficient time has elapsed to use it again safely. There is something about the inner dynamics of a group that makes group discussion the highly effective learning process psychologists and educators claim for it.

Real learning, as has been long accepted, must result in some appreciable change. As we view the development of formal education over the years we recognize that the first goal or aim of education was intellectual development. The latter was measured in terms of how much knowledge the individual acquired and his ability to think or reason logically. It was generally assumed, and it is still true in a large measure, that the possession of more knowledge can aid a person to reason more logically. The lecture method of teaching was the natural approach to the realization of these objectives. How better could a student obtain the desired information about any field of learning than directly from the mouth of the expert in that field. Reading from the book written by the expert was the next best thing. These two

methods are obviously still effective approaches in imparting information.

But, today there is increasing value placed upon behavioral change, which involves emotional change, as one of the primary goals of education. The lecture method, unfortunately, is not too well suited for achieving this objective.

We know from the experience of many people, casual observation, as well as scientific investigation, that people do not change their behavior merely because they have been given information which conclusively proves that they ought to change. The following statement on one of the studies mentioned by Dr. Stovall illustrates this point.

"Kurt Lewin reported the results of efforts during World War II to change the food habits of a number of housewives by means of lectures and group discussions. In the case of three groups, lectures were given by a nutritionist who stressed the health and economic reasons for use of beef hearts, kidneys, and sweetbreads. Mimeographed recipes were distributed and the women were strongly urged to use these meats. Another three groups discussed the matter with a nutritionist, and their discussion culminated in group decisions to try the meats. Subsequent investigation revealed that only three per cent of the women in the lecture groups actually served the meats while thirty-two per cent of those who participated in the discussion did so."

We know that behavioral changes cannot be effectively brought about even under continued exhortation, advice-giving, or under the threat of punishment. Behavioral change results best when the individual undergoes certain experiences (of which gaining knowledge is one) which gives him new insights, new values and new understandings which free him from certain compulsive ego needs. The dynamics existing in group discussions are better suited for such changes to take place than the dynamics existing in the lecture situation. Specifically, group discussions, under proper and competent leadership can bring about behavioral (and emotional change) because one or more of the following are possible:

1. Overt participation through personal contribution to the group discussions.

2. Covert participation by identification with the group leader or other members.
3. Role playing (conscious or unconscious).
4. Emotional release or catharsis through self-expression.
5. Transference of hostile impulses to various members of the group or to the leader who may represent parental, sibling or other images toward whom the individual may have repressed feelings.
6. Satisfaction of such ego needs as need for approval, recognition, praise, affection, or attention.

To what extent should teachers concerned with bringing about behavioral changes be trained in the use of the group dynamics approach in teaching?

* * * * *

Social Concepts in Social Studies

The learning of the meaning of words or concepts peculiar to a given area of knowledge or a given science is a recognized requisite to its full understanding. Vocabulary teaching has become, therefore, an integral phase of all teaching. In the field of the social studies, authors give heed to this fact by listing at the end of each chapter the *new* words used in the text or by adding a glossary at the end of the book. As teachers, we know that for students to gain the full meaning of many of the social concepts, much more is necessary than merely defining them. Most teachers realize how relatively ineffective is a dictionary type definition of such words as *nationalism*, *sovereignty*, *states rights* or *welfare state*. Students will frequently repeat parrot fashion the teacher's definition or the verbatim book definition of a new concept without appreciating or grasping the full meaning of the word.

A discussion of this problem is contained in "Teaching Social Concepts," an article by Edgar B. Wesley in *The Packet* (Fall, 1955), a little bulletin published by D. C. Heath and Co., for elementary teachers. The particular treatment of this all-important subject is as applicable to the secondary level (if not more so) as it is to the elementary level. Concepts or words have first a "denotative function" and second, a "connotative function." The denotative meaning of words, according to Dr. Wesley, presents no difficulty. It is merely a

matter of association and meaning. Few children have trouble with the denotative meanings of such concepts as *cat*, *ball*, *green* and *loud*. Dr. Wesley points out that *object teaching*, as used by Pestalozzi and Froebel, is nothing more than teaching by simple association. It is the most natural way of developing an understanding of the denotative aspect of concepts.

It is with this connotative meaning of words that difficulty is encountered, particularly with abstract concepts. Comic strip artists and cartoonists frequently capitalize on the tendency of children to give literal (denotative) interpretations to expressions they hear at home whose meaning is far removed from the literal meaning of the words. A child may unwittingly embarrass his parents by asking a visiting friend where his other face is, because his daddy referred to the visitor as being *two faced*. Writing on the interpretation of dreams (*Introduction to Psychoanalysis*) Freud commented on the fact that the unconscious mind is forced to utilize symbolism to portray such abstract concepts as justice, evil, and goodness. The mind, Freud stated, builds its dreams out of visual imagery, and to portray an abstract concept, it has to rely on some symbolic representation of that concept. That is why the interpretation of dreams is relatively a subjective process. The interpreter must be careful that he does not project his own apperceptive background into the symbolism of the dreamer.

Words such as loyalty, goodness, beautiful and courage have no single concrete association, such as the word cat or dog. A child can learn the meaning of the word "cat" by seeing a cat or a picture of the animal. There is no one picture or single experience of such words as beauty or goodness. Nor are there pictures or single experiences of such social concepts as nationalism, sovereignty and loyalty. All abstract concepts are generalizations of a variety of experiences embodying that concept. The word *beautiful* when applied to the word *thought* connotes a different meaning than when applied to such words as *dress* or *shoes*. The wider the associations a person has with any word, whether through direct personal experiences or through his readings, the richer will be his understanding of the connotative meanings of social concepts.

In teaching the understanding of abstract

social concepts it will also help, according to Dr. Wesley if the teacher departs from the usual (logical) approach of first defining the word and then giving an example to illustrate it. Much more effective would be to reverse the process, giving several examples and then defining it. Most children, in fact, when asked to define new words tend to give examples. Teachers might encourage students to give as many examples as they can, or present them himself, and then, on the basis of these examples, attempt with the class to arrive at an inclusive definition.

* * * * *

Educating the Human Side of the Engineer

There has been much concern in our country, recently, about our falling behind Russia in the training of people in the field of the sciences and engineering. This being an age of electronics and of automatism, the need for persons trained in the sciences cannot be overstressed. The very term *automatism*, however, calls to mind the word *automaton* and all that it implies in terms of rigidity, inflexibility and callousness with respect to human values in general. Education today, more so than at any other time, has the dual responsibility of training people to be both *specialists* and *well rounded people*. Our country needs scientists and engineers, but it also needs people educated in the humanities. Our country needs people trained in the use of the slide rule, but equally educated in the use of the ballot box and all that it implies in terms of intelligent and responsible citizenship. Automatism can take place in an atmosphere of dictatorship or in an atmosphere of democracy. To insure that the latter will be the case in our country, our colleges and other institutions of higher learning must train the future scientist and engineer in more than mathematics and science. Responsibilities of leadership in technology require "a broad and deep understanding of human values and human behavior in order to carry out properly (those) responsibilities of leadership."¹

HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL LIVING

A Course Outline in Lesson Form

for

High School Students

LESSON 7

LEARNING TO LIVE WITH OUR EMOTIONS

Beginning the Lesson

Have a class discussion centering on: What

may be the ill or damaging effects resulting from (1) emotional outbursts or lack of emotional control; (2) prolonged emotional states of anger or fear. Have students cite examples from their own personal experience or observations.

Words and Concepts We Need To Know and Understand

Aggression: Destructive action or behavior towards someone, resulting from feelings of anger or hostility; the act of attacking or hurting someone.

Anxiety: A diffused state of disturbance sometimes due to a specific fear, but generally found in certain kinds of emotionally sick people.

Dependence: Needing the support and help of other people. Over-dependence in adults represents a type of emotional immaturity wherein the individual is unable to assume normal responsibilities of everyday living. Infancy is the stage of complete dependency.

Emotional maturity: An all-inclusive phrase used to describe all the complex characteristics which enable a person to be relatively self-sufficient and to live in harmony with himself and with the world.

Emotional immaturity: An all-inclusive term used to describe a person who is basically childish or infantile in his emotional make-up and behavior. An emotionally immature person is unable to adapt himself to the various demands of life.

Hostility: Feelings of anger, jealousy, resentment or hate towards someone. Sometimes feelings of hostility may be unconscious, so that the individual is not aware that he has them.

Independence: Capable of being self-sufficient; not needing support or help. Feeling over-independent may indicate a psychological reaction against needing help, which may hinder a person's normal cooperation with others.

Psychosomatic illness: A disease caused by prolonged emotional tensions or mental disturbances.

Regression: A return to behavior or actions which the individual has outgrown or used as a child, because of emotional disturbances generally associated with feelings of insecurity.

Self-sufficiency: Having the ability to assume

charge and manage one's own life with relatively little need for support from others.

Sublimation: Originally an unconscious process by which unexpended energy generated by the sex urge is redirected to creative or socially useful activities. More recently: The redirection of *any* emotional energy (love, anger, fear) into creative or useful channels.

THINGS TO DO

A. Answer the Following Questions

1. What may be some of the damaging effects of uncontrolled emotions?
2. How may pent up anger boomerang against oneself?
3. How may prolonged fear be harmful to the body?
4. What are some of the illnesses believed to be psychosomatic in origin?
5. Why is it more likely that people today have more psychosomatic illnesses than did primitive man?
6. In what way is the autonomic nervous system linked to psychosomatic illnesses?
7. What are some of the possible bodily reactions to fear when flight is blocked?
8. What can a person do to minimize the ill effects of emotional disturbances?
9. How can one gain in emotional maturity?

B. Projects and Reports

1. Make a two column chart showing some of the major characteristics of an emo-

tionally mature and an emotionally immature person.

2. Committee reports: Read current magazine articles on psychosomatic illnesses (check with Readers' Guide for Periodical Literature). Report to class.
3. Report on current newspaper accounts illustrating damaging effects resulting from lack of emotional control. Discuss in class.
4. Psychodrama: Portray family scenes in which one or more members behave in an emotional immature way. Portray same scene wherein all members display emotional maturity.
5. Make a personal chart, listing in two columns the characteristics about yourself which you consider immature and mature.

C. What to Read

Cosgrove, Marjorie C. and Josey, Mary I., *About You*. Chapter 2: How Personality Grows. Chapter 3: A Healthy Personality.

Duvall, Evelyn Millis, *Family Living*. Chapter 1: How Grown Up Are You?

Overstreet, H. A. *The Mature Mind*.

Fedder, Ruth, *A Girl Grows Up*.

Engle, T. L. *Psychology*. Chapter 14: Mental Hygiene.

¹ Quarterly Report, Carnegie Corporation of New York, January, 1955.

Visual and Other Aids

IRWIN A. ECKHAUSER

Washington Junior High School, Mt. Vernon, New York

Secondary and elementary schools looking for a good bibliography of aviation education materials will find it in *Aviation Education Bibliography*. This free booklet may be obtained on request to the National Aviation Education Council, 1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

A series of motion pictures dealing with slum prevention, highway improvement, home beautification, and other community problems

are described in a free booklet, "The American Community." Write to Association Films, 347 Madison Ave., New York 17, N. Y.

The Topical Review Book Company, 131 North St., Auburn, N. Y., publishes a variety of review booklets, handbooks, and sample tests for senior high school social studies courses:

Topical Review of World History

New Type Tests for Topical Review of World History

Topical Review of New York State
Regents Examinations in World History

FILMS

Crusade for Freedom—1956. 14 min. Sound. Free. Crusade for Freedom, 345 E. 46th St., New York 17, N. Y.

This film is an anti-American propaganda film shown in theaters behind the Iron Curtain. Many of the scenes are taken from a Russian movie which gives a twisted picture of life in America. It also shows pictures of Radio Free Europe's 29 broadcasting stations in West Germany and Portugal, as well as the launching of Free Europe Press Balloons which carry miniature newspapers into the captive countries behind the Iron Curtain. John Daly and Westbrook Van Voorhees are commentators for the film.

Guest reviewer: Robert Storms, Des Moines, Iowa.

Bogata. 11 min. Color. Sale. B&W. International Film Bureau, Inc. Chicago 4, Ill.

Shown in the film are historical places, people in the streets, markets, recreational areas, transportation facilities, living facilities, schools and centers of government activity.

The Republic of Colombia. 11 min. Color. B&W. Sale. International Films Bureau, Inc., Chicago 4, Ill.

Emphasizes present-day Colombia by showing the major cities and typical economic and cultural activities as well as the most important natural geographical features of the country.

Republic of Guatemala. 22 min. Color. B&W. Sale. International Film Bureau, Inc., Chicago 4, Ill.

Modern life from market place to the finest residential areas is treated, and present-day culture in Guatemala is depicted.

United States Expansion: Florida. 25 min. Sound. Color. B&W. Sale. Coronet Films, Chicago 1, Ill.

The film shows how geography has influenced the region's early history. The Spanish Missionary period, the era of the English plantation system, the second Spanish period, and the events that led to its becoming part of the U. S. are given meaning through re-enactments on the original sites.

United States Expansion: Texas and the Far Southwest. 25 min. Sound. Color. B&W. Sale. Coronet Films, Chicago 1, Ill.

The development of this vast area is traced from early Spanish explorations through important events such as the Texas Revolution, the Mexican War, the admission of Texas as a state, and the opening of the Far Southwest to American immigration and settlement.

United States Expansion: Oregon Country. 25 min. Sound, Color. B&W. Sale. Coronet Films, Chicago 1, Ill.

The film surveys key events in the history of the region. Among these are the Lewis and Clark expedition, the subsequent westward movement, the rivalry of British and American interests, and the acquisition of the Oregon Territory by the U. S. in 1846.

Pioneer Boy of the Midwest. 25 min. Sound. Color. B&W. Sale. Coronet Films, Chicago 1, Ill.

Film shows how David and his family lived from the land and the forest. Depicts also his schooling, his activities, and the work of his family.

Pioneer Community of the Midwest. 25 min. Sound. Color. B&W. Sale. Coronet Films, Chicago 1, Ill.

Finding a community with a doctor, store, postal service, blacksmith, and shoemaker, the Wilsons settle, and we learn of the economic, political, and recreational aspects of early Midwest pioneer community life.

FILMSTRIPS

America's Power Resources. 53 fr. B&W. Sale. Discussion manual. Office of Educational Activities, *The N. Y. Times*, Times Sq., New York 36, N. Y.

Changes in sources of power in the last hundred years and the impact of abundant power on the country's life are outlined.

The Fundamentals of Geography. (Set of 10.) Sale. The Filmstrip House, 15 W. 46th St., New York 36, N. Y.

Depicts the natural features and resources of our earth, so that students can understand the earth on which they live (25 fr. each).

The Solar System and The Universe
The Earth on Which We Live
The Earth and Its Motions
Latitude, Longitude, and Time
The Waters Around Us
Maps, Globes and Graphs
Violent Forces of Nature
Air and the Weather

Book Reviews and Book Notes

DAVID W. HARR

Head, Department of Social Studies, Abraham Lincoln High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Mine Workers' District 50: The Story of the Gas, Coke, and Chemical Unions of Massachusetts and Their Growth Into a National Union. By James Nelson. New York: Exposition Press, 1955. Pp. 158. \$2.75. \$2.75.

This book attempts, with considerable success, to fill one portion of a large gap in our studies of the American labor movement: accounts, by union organizers themselves, of the formation of particular unions and the problems encountered along the way. The English-born Mr. Nelson, who served as a machinist apprentice, draftsman, mechanic, and production supervisor before embarking upon a full-time career as a labor organizer in the gas and coke industries, brings to his narrative an experience and awareness that no outside expert could possibly capture. It is this obvious working familiarity with the problems and procedures involved in organizing a new union that gives *The Mine Workers' District 50* its distinctive value.

The author introduces his study with a brief sketch of the conditions in the then unorganized gas and coke-oven plants in the Boston area at the onset of the depression. Pointing out both the benefits and disadvantages accruing to unorganized workers in these industries, Mr. Nelson discusses the formation of the first local unions under the impetus of the New Deal labor legislation, the affiliation of these locals with the American Federation of Labor, a few of the influential leaders in the movement, and the problems faced by the new unions in their early years. Of central interest is the account of how the new gas and coke unions strove vainly to secure an industrial-union charter from the AFL, an effort that coincided with the great industrial-union vs. trade-union schism in labor's ranks in 1935 and the formation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Natu-

rally enough, the CIO, and in particular John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers, looked with sympathy on the aspirations of the gas and coke workers, who under Nelson's leadership obtained industrial-union status in 1936 as District 50, UMW. The remainder of the narrative recounts the expansion of District 50 from a small New England council of locals into a strong national union, and with the new problems faced by such a nation-wide industrial organization. Students of labor history may regret the absence of a bibliography and of more detailed, concisely footnoted descriptions of early union meetings, organizational matters, etc., but they will welcome Mr. Nelson's judicious and dispassionate account as an important case-history that should point the way to further studies of a similar nature.

WILLIAM B. CATTON

University of Maryland
College Park, Md.

Organizing the Teaching Profession—The Story of the American Federation of Teachers. By the Commission on Educational Reconstruction of the A.F.T. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press. Pp. 320. \$4.50.

Ideally, Boards of Public Education, administrators and teachers should work together in perfect harmony to provide the finest schools our wealthy nation can afford. Ideally, since there is no conceded profit motive, the vocabulary of the market-place should be inappropriate to a consideration of school problems. But that the status of education in our nation today is far from ideal, no one will deny. "Organizing the Teaching Profession" deals with actualities. Among the lobbies which infest our law-making bodies, a lobby for Education is conspicuous by its absence. Indeed, the Economy zealots are in the ascendancy and pressure is applied, not to raise funds, but to keep taxes down. All too frequently, school boards are passive, and

administrators, taking their cue from those who hold the power to promote, fall in line. Teachers, unorganized, or organized under the leadership of administrators, are helpless. "The trouble with your teachers' organizations," the engineer in a public high school once said, "is that 7000 members vote YES and one votes NO—and the No's have it."

The story of the American Federation of Teachers, founded in 1916, is the story of a grass roots movement among teachers to help themselves. Cognizant that the public schools owe their existence to labor, and recognizing their economic identity with other workers, they decided to affiliate with the American Federation of Labor. The Constitution set forth the following objectives:

1. To bring associations of teachers into relations of mutual assistance and cooperation.
2. To obtain for them all the rights to which they are entitled.
3. To raise the standards of the teaching profession by securing the conditions essential to the best professional service.
4. To promote such democratization of the schools as will enable them better to equip their pupils to take their places in the industrial, social, and political life of the community.

The fourth aim, emphasizing teacher responsibility, disproves the contention that it is unprofessional to join a union, since regard for and service to the public is inherent in its philosophy.

This book highlights the history of the A.F.T. It can be divided into three sections. The first section is concerned with the struggle for survival and growth of locals. Numerous case histories attest the courage required to overcome the antagonism of powerful interests which did not hesitate to threaten and dismiss the recalcitrant joiner. The battle against political corruption, authoritarianism, denial of the rights of teachers as persons, and as citizens to work on community programs for civic improvement loomed even larger than the fight for higher salaries, smaller classes, satisfactory working conditions and academic freedom. The fight to win rights for themselves and their profession leads naturally to section two: How

to make a better world for their students.

A philosophy of education is enunciated. Teacher and student alike must be accorded simple human dignity and the economic, social and political conditions which make this possible. Teachers have no desire to usurp the duties of administrators. They do, however, believe that there should be regular procedures for democratic conferences so that their professional judgment can be given weight in matters affecting the life and programs of the schools. Full equality of educational opportunity still does not exist, and the Federation has consistently backed proposals to attain this end. Nothing short of full teacher participation in the formulation of educational policy will insure the survival of democratic values in human affairs.

An appendix consisting of documentary evidence follows the text, and comprises section three.

Professors Axtelle, Childs and Counts and Arthur Elder, Carl J. Megel and the others who are responsible for this volume are to be congratulated.

CONSTANCE L. ROSENTHAL

South Philadelphia High School
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Political Science, Terms and Basic Theories, Institutions and Practices, 13th Edition. By G. A. Jacobsen and M. H. Lipman. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1955. Pp. 244. \$1.25.

Instructors frequently tend to be intolerant of course digests and review books because, in practice, a too glib generalization may assume greater priority in the student's mind than a well-ordered and cogently-reasoned exposition in which the various facets of the problem or issue are thoroughly explored and rationally set down in terms of precedence.

This second approach, of course, requires that the student "think" about the matter and sometimes—through either innocence or ignorance—such a process has become extremely unpopular, if not downright taboo.

Contrary to the fears set down above this new handbook for *Political Science* issued by Barnes and Noble appears to have merit in terms of organization, clarity, and inclusive-

ness. While the student *might* come from its reading with only a few memorized terms or expressions in mind, he probably would not.

This is not to say that background is unimportant. It is all-important. However, one frames a house before he begins the task of developing the specialized units within it. He even has a blueprint before he lays the foundation. If this analogy will suffice, *Political Science* can be used as a guide, syllabus, or—at the end—a review manual. And, for the purpose, it is a very good and complete one.

Frequent charts and diagrams are used to interpret the text and a series of examination questions and references are provided.

The book attempts to cover the area between "Theory of the State" and "Local Government." Naturally, it is somewhat concentrated and sometimes rather staccato. Nevertheless, for the purposes indicated, it should be rather satisfactory and ought to be recommended for use.

KENNETH V. LOTTICK

Willamette University
Salem, Oregon

Social Problems in America: A Source Book, (Rev. Ed.) By A. M. Lee and E. B. Lee. Henry Holt & Co., N. Y.: 1955. Pp. 483. \$3.75.

Social Problems in America contains one hundred sixty-five articles covering a wide variety of subjects. The selection of readings is excellent and the organization of the items in terms of the following eight major headings is very good: I. Frames of Reference, II. Man and Land, III. Problem Periods in Family Life, IV. Major Institutional Problems, V. The Atypical, VI. Social Division, VII. Social Crises, and VIII. Toward Adjustment.

The editors' introductory remarks at the beginning of each of the eight sections presumably tie together the articles in the given section. However, in this respect, the comments are all too brief for relating the disparate readings in any given section and fail to relate the sections to each other in a meaningful social problems framework. The authors are to be credited for their skill in excerpting lengthy articles and for including cross-references to popular textbooks, excellent bibliographies, and stimulating questions at the end of each section.

The book affords the undergraduate student an opportunity to familiarize himself with the theoretical approaches of such writers as L. Frank, G. H. Mead, and R. Merton as well as a good collection of empirical research projects conducted by Burgess, Warner, Elliott, Mowrer, Green and Rose. In addition the editors include journalistic accounts of social situations and the special pleadings of pressure groups.

All in all, the book provides a cineramic view of American social problems from the standpoint of the social scientist, literary exponent, and special pleader. It is a supplemental text with contents that students would find interesting and instructors would find to contain an excellent selection of illustrative materials for courses in social problems, social pathology, or social disorganization.

ANNABELLE B. MOTZ

University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780. By Robert E. Brown. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955. Pp. ix, 458. \$6.00.

This is an important book. It is almost certain to be a controversial one, as well.

In this study, Professor Brown of Michigan State University contends that the society in Massachusetts which effected political separation from Great Britain held property and consequently the potential for political activity that went with it. Since such a society was, he insists, democratic to begin with, it did not need to wage an internal revolution along with the external one in order to determine who should rule at home. The evidence he marshals to substantiate his claims is impressive.

Such evidence lies in the first six chapters, where Professor Brown indicates what property one had to have, as an adult male, to vote in province and town elections in eighteenth-century Massachusetts. He concludes that property-holding was far wider than traditionally supposed, and hence so was the right to the ballot. The author then tests this impressive finding in the balance of his book by applying it to the Bay Province's history from the new charter of 1691 to the adoption of the State constitution of 1780.

En route, he breaks lances with many a con-

ventional interpretation and many a contemporary scholar. The unintended result is that his footnotes very often make more interesting reading than his text.

Professor Brown has nevertheless done handsomely by his researches. The Cornell University Press, which published this book for the American Historical Association, has also done handsomely by him in producing an attractively printed work. Its usefulness is further enhanced by a full bibliography and a serviceable index.

MALCOLM FRIEBERG

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

HELPFUL CLASSROOM AIDS

GENERAL

Find It Yourself. By Elizabeth Sciepture and Margaret R. Greer. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1955. Pp. 64. 40 cents. Revised Edition.

Teachers and librarians will find this volume an indispensable aid in teaching how's and why's of reference tools and libraries.

The text is arranged into 8 lessons dealing with: books, dictionaries, general encyclopedias, classification of card catalog, "Readers' Guide," special reference books, pamphlets and visual aids, and taking notes.

Congress and Civil War. By Edward Bay Kin. New York: The McBride Company, 1955, \$5.00.

The central issue of the book is Congress' own inner wrestling with the question of a strong union versus states' rights.

All the outstanding leaders of this period, both North and South, appear in its pages.

High school teachers can recommend the book to their pupils.

PAMPHLETS

The Role of Political Parties, U.S.A. By Joseph C. Harseh. Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, Incorporated, 461 Fourth Ave., New York 16, New York. Price 25 cents per copy.

Choosing the President of the U.S.A. By Katernyn H. Stone. Price 25 cents per copy.

Simplified Parliamentary Procedure. Compiled by Mrs. Harry H. Thomas. Copies free.

Both pamphlets can be secured by writing to the League of Women Voters of the United States, New York 16, New York.

ARTICLES

"Current History: Today's Imperative." *Civic Leader*, Volume XXV, Number 18, January 23, 1956.

Excerpts from authoritative reports and studies emphasizing the necessity for understanding today's world.

"Farm Price Supports a Good Policy." By George D. Taylor and Charles B. Shuman, *Rotarian*, January, 1956.

"What's Behind the New Farm Crisis," *Business Week*, December 10, 1955.

"Russia's Way of Life and Ours," *American Observer*, Volume XXV, Number 18, January 23, 1956.

CURRENT PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Our Human Rights. By Rebecca Chalmers Barton. Washington, D. C. Public Affairs Press, 1956. Pp. xxv, 202. \$2.50.

On the Nature of Man. By Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 105. \$3.00.

God and Country. By Charles Schoenfeld. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. xv, 120. \$3.00.

Science and Modern Life. By Sir E. John Russell. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 101. \$2.75.

The Philosophy of Epictetus. By John Boriforte. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 146. \$3.00.

Our Homes and Our Neighbors. By Frances Carpenter. New York: American Book Company, 1956. Pp. 192. \$2.32.

Lincoln and the Bluegrass. By William H. Townsend. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1955. Pp. xix, 392. \$6.50.

Essays in Human Relations. By David Greenwood. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956. Pp. vi, 76. \$2.00.

The House of Peace. By Louisa A. Dyer. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956. Pp. xxx, 190. \$3.00.

American Values and Problems Today. By Chester D. Babcock and I. James Quillen. New York: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1956. Pp. viii, 527. \$3.00.

Moral Principles in the Bible. By Ben Kinipel. New York: R. E. Burdick, 1956. Pp. vi, 172. \$4.50.

HISPANIC AMERICA SERIES SERIE HISPANOAMERICANA

Dual Text: English and Spanish

16 LARGE SCALE MAPS WITH STUDIES IN INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

D
E
N
O
Y
R

The story of peoples is interwoven in the geography of the region in which they live. These 16 maps depict the history, together with the economic and political development of all sections of Hispanic America in their geographic setting.

Heavy Manila, cloth taped edges, and large eyelets for hanging, for only \$2.25 per map. Prices vary with styles of mounting.

Write for Circular G11

GEPPERT COMPANY

WALL MAPS

Each 44 x 22"

In color

- HA1 Relief and Culture
- HA2 Discovery of America
- HA3 The Caribbean, 1492-1843
- HA4 European Expansion to 1800
- HA5 Hispanic America, 16th Century
- HA6 Colonial Trade and Government
- HA7 Colonial Expansion, 1700 and 1763
- HA8 Spain's N. Frontier, 1763-1800
- HA9 Struggle for Independence
- HA10 Hemisphere Solidarity
- HA11 Mexico
- HA12 Caribbean Region
- HA13 Brazil and Colombia
- HA14 Argentina and Chile
- HA15 Population
- HA16 Economic and Communications

Manual free with sets of eight

5235-59 Ravenswood Ave., Chicago 40

HISTORICAL FICTION

and other reading references for JUNIOR and SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

By HANNAH LOGASA, University of Chicago

This *fifth* enlarged and revised edition of Miss Logasa's popular reference book is brought completely up-to-date and now includes a new section on "Our Cultural Heritage and Its Modern Expression."

On each of the several thousand books listed in *Historical Fiction*, the author, title, publisher and publication date is furnished, together with a one-line description, giving the time, place and characters dealt with in the book. Interesting narrative, biographic and source books are also included in this complete list.

Miss Logasa's book is an excellent method of correlating reading in Social Studies and English classes.

Price: \$4.50 a copy, postage extra.

McKINLEY DESK OUTLINE MAPS

Sizes and Prices of Desk Outline Maps

aa—size 15 x 20 ins. \$3.72 per hundred b—size 7½ x 10 ins. \$.93 per hundred
a—size 10 x 15 ins. \$1.86 per hundred c—size 5½ x 7½ ins. \$.70 per hundred

Carriage Extra

AMERICAN HISTORY

Athens	148bc	Italy	132abc
Egypt	140bc	Italy, Central	133b
Europe	101ab	Mediterranean World	113abc
Europe, Central & Southern	111ab	Palestine	138abc
Eastern World	135abc	Roman Empire	184ab, 186ab
Greece	131b	Rome	142bc
Greece & Aegean	130abc		
India	148ab		

COLLEGE ENTRANCE MAPS

Ancient History 20aa

MEDIEVAL & MODERN HISTORY

Austro-Hungary in 1914	126b	France, Netherlands & England	124abc
Balkan Region	98ab	Germany in 1914	125c
Baltic Lands	114ab	Germany in 1914 & 1920	125ab
British Isles	120abc	Japan & Eastern China	149ab
Eastern World	135abc	China	150ab
England	121abc	Mediterranean World	113ab
Europe (bds. of 1921)	72ab, 82abc	Russia in 1914	127ab
Europe (bds. of 1914)	89abc, 101b	Spain	128bc
Europe (no bds.)	99ab, 22aa, 101a	World, Elliptical (bds.)	27aa, 70ab
Europe, Central (bds. of 1914)	112a	World, Mercator (no bds.)	28aa, 71ab, 81abc, 100ab
Europe, Central (no bds.)	21aa, 112b	World, Divided at 60° East	
Europe, Central & Southern in 1914	111ac	Longitude (no bds.)	108ab
Europe, Central & Southern (no bds.)	111b		
Europe, Southeast & East Mediter- ranean	115abc		

COLLEGE ENTRANCE MAPS

European & English History 18aa

AMERICAN HISTORY

Central America & Mexico (bds.)	170ab	Southern States	184b, 188abc
Eastern United States (bds.)	177abc, 196ab	South Atlantic Colonies	189b
Europe in 1921	72ab, 82abc	South America (bds.)	76ab, 86abc, 105ab
Middle Atlantic States	183b, 187abc	Southwestern United States (no bds.)	171b
Middle Atlantic Colonies	195b	United States (bds.)	29aa, 78ab, 160ab, 175ab, 176ab
Mississippi Valley	178abc	United States (no bds.)	88abc
New England States	152b, 135abc	West Indies & Mexico (no bds.)	172ab
New England Colonies	186b	World Elliptical (bds.)	27aa, 70ab
North America (National bds.)	75ab, 85abc, 104ab	World Mercator (no bds.)	28aa, 71ab, 81abc, 100ab
North America (State & Province bds.)	25aa, 79a	World, Divided at 60° East Longitude	
Pacific Coast	179abc, 180b	(no bds.)	108ab
Pacific Ocean	107ab		
Philippine Islands	266bc		

COLLEGE ENTRANCE MAPS

American History, United States &
Central America 19aa

Write for Complete Catalog and Samples

McKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

809-811 North 19th Street

Philadelphia 30, Pa.